

*2/10/1911*

**Proceedings of  
New Jersey Socialist  
Unity Conference**





3

PROCEEDINGS  
OF  
New Jersey Socialist  
Unity Conference  
Including the Manifesto



AS ADOPTED AND AUTHORIZED FOR PUBLI-  
CATION BY THE CONFERENCE



JAMES M. REILLY  
Secretary for Socialist Party

JOHN HOSSACK  
Secretary for Socialist Labor Party



## GREETING.

---

THE pamphlet here presented to the reader, contains the authorized minutes of the New Jersey Socialist Conference, preceded by the official communications which led to the holding of the Conference. The Conference held six sessions, beginning December 17, 1905, and ending March 4, 1906.

The Conference, realizing the importance of its labors being made generally known to all Socialists, takes this means of furnishing the information to them.

Copies of this document may be obtained by applying to:

JAMES M. REILLY,  
285 Barrow St., Jersey City, N. J.

JOHN HOSSACK,  
246 Princeton Ave., Jersey City, N. J.

Price, 5 cents per copy.

In lots of 25 or more,

4 cents each, prepaid.

812673



# MANIFESTO.

Adopted

By the New Jersey Socialist Conference At Newark, N. J.,  
March 4, 1906.

The Conference of representatives of the Socialist Party and the Socialist Labor Party, of New Jersey, elected by a general vote of the membership of the Socialist Party and the Socialist Labor Party of the State, upon the initiative of the Socialist Party, to consider the causes of the division between the two camps, and ascertain, if possible, whether solid ground could be found for a union of the militant Socialist forces of the State, and thereby of the land, hereby makes its joint report to its two respective constituencies.

\* \* \*

We are happy to say that our conclusions have been unanimously arrived at, in many instances, and in all others by virtual unanimity.

It did not take the Conference long to be one as to the essential reasons for the present deplorable division, consequently, it was no difficult matter to be ultimately agreed upon the essentials for the solid foundation for a united political Socialist movement.

We found that this foundation turned upon two points—first, the proper attitude for a political party of Socialism to assume toward the burning question of trades unionism, and, second, the proper attitude for a political party of Socialism to assume toward the ownership of its press, the voice of the movement.

\* \* \*

## NEW JERSEY UNITY CONFERENCE.

v

### Unionism.

As to the first, the Conference holds: (as the subjoined resolutions I., II., and III., set forth in detail) that, without the political movement is backed by a class-conscious, that is, a properly constructed economic organization, ready to take and hold and conduct the productive powers of the land, and thereby ready and able to enforce if need be, and when need be, the fiat of the Socialist ballot of the working class—that WITHOUT such a body in existence, the Socialist political movement will be but a flash in the pan, successful, at best, in affording political preferment to scheming intellectuals, and thereby powerful only to attract such elements. On this specific head the Conference moreover holds, that a political party of Socialism which marches to the polls unarmed by such a properly constructed economic organization, but invites a catastrophe over the land in the measure that it strains for political success, and in the measure that it achieves it. It must be an obvious fact to all serious observers of the times, that the day of the political success of such a party in America, would be the day of its defeat, immediately followed by an industrial and financial crisis, from which none would suffer more than the working class itself.

The Conference holds that for the Socialist political movement to favor A. F. of L. craft unionism is to bluntly deny Socialist principles and aims, for no matter how vigorously the A. F. of L. may cry "Organize! Organize!" in practice it seeks to keep the unorganized, the overwhelming majority of the working class, out of the organization. The facts can easily be proved to a candid world. High initiation fees, limitation of apprentices, cornering the jobs for the few whom they admit into the organization, are but a few of the methods used to discourage organization, which results, not only in lack of organization, but by the craft form of what organization they do have, they isolate the workers into groups, which, left to fight for themselves in time



of conflict, become the easy prey of the capitalists. On the other hand, the readiness with which certain portions of the exploiting class force their victims to join the A. F. of L. is sufficient condemnation of the organization.

By its own declarations and acts, the A. F. of L. shows that it accepts wage slavery as a finality; and, holding that there is no identity of interest between employer and employe, the A. F. of L. follows it out by gladly accepting the vice-presidency of the Belmont Civic Federation for its president, Gompers, thus allying itself with an organization fathered by the capitalist class for the purpose of blurring the class struggle, and for prolonging the present system which is cornered upon the exploitation of labor.

For these reasons the Conference concludes that it is the duty of a political party of Socialism to promote the organization of a properly constructed union, both by elucidating the virtues of such a union and by exposing the vices of craft unionism. Consequently, and as a closing conclusion on this head, it rejects as impracticable, vicious, and productive only of corruption, the theory of neutrality on the economic field. The Conference, true to these views, condemns the A. F. of L. as an obstacle to the emancipation of the working class.

Holding that the political power flows from and is a result of economic power, and that the capitalist is entrenched in the government as the result of his industrial power, the Conference commends as useful to the emancipation of the working class, the Industrial Workers of the World, which instead of running away from the class struggle bases itself squarely upon it, and boldly and correctly sets out the Socialist principle "that the working class and the employing class have nothing in common" and that "the working class must come together on the political as well as on the industrial field, to take and hold that which they produce by their labor."

### Party Press.

As to the second, the question of the proper attitude for a political party of Socialism to assume toward the ownership of its press, and literary agencies, the Conference holds (as the subjoined resolutions IV., V., VI., VII., set forth in detail) that the revolutionary movement of the working class must have its press. A condition of things that would justify some to maintain that the political party of Socialism has no press, and others to maintain with equal sincerity that it has, is incompatible with that oneness of opinion on essentials that must typify the political party of Socialism. The press and literary agencies are the most powerful weapons of the party. Past and present experience prove that the party but invites annoyance, if not ultimate discomfiture, by allowing its press and literary agencies to be owned, whatever the guise of such ownership may be, in such manner that any one person or set of persons may retain proprietorship over it, whether it be in the party's wisdom or folly, such person, or set of persons, have been thrown out of the party organization.

The party's press and literary agencies must be the party's property. The party itself, and not any one person, or set of persons, however admirable they may be, must have the sole and absolute jurisdiction over the management and contents of the party press and literary agencies. The editors and administrators of the party's press and literary agencies must be the appointees exclusively of the party itself; and their removal must rest with the party only, and must be effective irrespective of any other one person or set of persons. The party itself must be the supreme tribunal that shall pass upon the contents of its press and literature. A democratic organization, of such numbers as a political party of Socialism implies, recognizes the necessity of order with freedom, and of freedom with order. The officials placed immediately in charge of the party's press and literary agencies must feel responsible and dependent upon the party only.



Their high office of trust clothes them with a necessary, but only preliminary authority. Above them in supreme authority must be the party be, with its membership reachable upon all subjects and with power to utter its final decree.

Short of all this, all of which flows from the party's direct ownership, the party's press and literary agencies are a perpetual threat to the party's welfare, being a perpetual threat to the fullness of information and that civilized right of free speech without which no organization can weather the revolutionary storm.

True to these views, the Conference condemns the private ownership as harmful and commends the rigid party ownership as indispensable to the party safety.

\* \* \*

### Discipline.

In a political party of Socialism the word discipline has its two-fold application. First, the discipline of obedience to facts and obedience to the rules and regulations that the facts prescribe for the realization of the Socialist aim. This is the discipline of education. It is not, nor can it be, produced by party legislation. It is the product of correct training. Necessary to it are unity of purpose, unity of method. The Socialist movement cannot be all things to all men; it can be only one thing, and to only one class—the working class.

Second, discipline also implies the power of the party to visit, with censure or expulsion as punishments, infractions or offences against the party's rules or principles. Rigid adherence to party principle and tactics being necessary to Socialist success, transgressions against the party must be met with punishment according to the gravity of the offence. Membership in the party being voluntary, and the discipline being self-imposed, he who subscribes to the party's ethics does so, not as one yielding submission to imposed authority, but as one bowing to the neces-

sity and desire of maintaining strict adherence to principle and for orderly government in party affairs.

Discipline in this, its two-fold application, is a recognition that knowledge is power and that in union is strength.

\* \* \*

Having closed its labors by setting forth the causes of the separation of the Socialist forces of the State of New Jersey, and of the nation, and by setting forth the solid ground upon which the militant Socialists of New Jersey, and of the nation, can unite into one solid army for working class emancipation, this Conference hands its findings to its two respective constituencies with a firm reliance that good sense and judgment will mark the deliberations of both. The Conference relies upon it, that a due appreciation of the great and far reaching consequences to the labor movement, will animate both its constituencies; and that, inspired by such sentiments, and realizing that his act, in voting upon these important measures, will have far-reaching effect upon our common goal, the overthrow of capitalist domination, each of our members will weigh well and consider the recommendations herein made, and then cast his vote honestly, fearlessly, and conscientiously.

With Socialist greeting, fraternally,

### NEW JERSEY SOCIALIST CONFERENCE.

Socialist Party—Burgess, Cassens, Glanz, Green, Headley, Hueck, James, Killingbeck, Reilly, Ullman, Wilson; not voting, Walker.

Socialist Labor Party—B. Burgholz, Eck, Fallath, Frueh, Gallo, Hossack, McGarry, Mattick, Oatley, Quinlan, Rapp, Schmitter.



## RESOLUTIONS.

### I.

Resolved, That the Socialist political movement of the working class cannot remain neutral to the organized effort of the working class to better their economic conditions on class-conscious, revolutionary lines.

### II.

Resolved, That the A. F. of L. form of organization and its principles are an obstacle to working class emancipation.

### III.

Resolved, That the Conference places itself on record as recognizing the usefulness of the Industrial Workers of the World to the proletarian movement, that is, to the Socialist movement.

### IV.

Resolved, That this Conference places itself on record as being opposed to all privately owned papers espousing the cause of labor, i. e., the Socialist cause.

### V.

Resolved, That this Conference places itself on record as looking upon all papers as privately owned, the property of which is not vested directly in the party through a committee or source designated by the party for such purpose.

### VI.

Resolved, That this Conference places itself on record as recognizing that the Socialist movement cannot control a privately owned press. That privately owned Socialist papers cannot be controlled by the true proletarian political movement, i. e. the Socialist movement. But that, contrarily, such privately owned papers tend to control the movement.

### VII.

Resolved, This conference places itself on record with the following, as embodying, what in its judgment, constitutes and is essential to party ownership of the Socialist press: Resolved, That a party owned press is a press all the property of which is vested in the party national organization as an unincorporated body. Over a party owned press no one, who is not a member of the party, can exercise any control directly or indirectly, whether in editorial, reportorial or administrative capacity; and over which none who ceases to be a member of the party can retain such control. We consider it essential to the safeguarding and purity of the party ownership of the press, that no member is free to start a political paper without previous sanction from the highest national executive body of the party, nor to own any share in any privately owned political paper.

### VIII.

Resolved, That this conference places itself on record as being opposed to the form of organization commonly called state autonomy, now in vogue in the Socialist Party.

### IX.

Whereas, It is evident that the capitalists are thoroughly organized as a class, for the one purpose of exploiting the working class. This organization positively implies the further and ever further subjugation of the class that produces all wealth by the processes inherent in and inseparable from the capitalist mode of production, and tends to equalize the Caucasian workingman with the Chinese coolie; and

Whereas, The capitalist organizations, both economic and political, bow down to a rigid discipline for this purpose solely; therefore, be it

Resolved, By this unity conference that in view of the foregoing facts, it becomes self-evident that workingmen organized in either economic or political organizations must also bow down



to a rigid self-imposed discipline with eyes forever fixed upon the opposite goal, that is, the complete emancipation of the working class by the overthrow of all the master classes.

## X.

Resolved, That in the event of the findings of this Conference being approved by the S. P. and the S. L. P. in the state of New Jersey, steps be taken to bring about a national conference between the two organizations, in order to bring about unity on a national basis; and we the delegates here assembled pledge ourselves to take the necessary steps, immediately, on the acceptance of the basis of unity by our respective state organizations, calling upon our national organizations to issue the necessary referendums.

## PRELIMINARY CORRESPONDENCE.

## I.

Orange, N. J., Sept. 10, 1905.

Mr. John Hossack:

Dear Sir—I am informed that you are the N. J. State Secretary for the Socialist Labor Party; if I am misled in this, will you kindly forward to the proper authority?

At our State Convention a resolution was adopted and accepted by referendum vote of the State, by a large majority, a copy of which I enclose, looking to a union of the Socialist forces of our State. This afternoon the committee met, and I was instructed to write to you, asking your organization to elect a like number of delegates to meet with us and discuss the feasibility of meeting together on some common ground, forming a united party, and thus presenting a solid front to the common enemy, "Capitalism." Hoping to hear from you at an early date, I remain, fraternally yours,

W. B. Killingbeck, Sec'y.

P. S.—If agreeable to your committee, we can meet at the above marked address on any date most suitable to you, Sunday preferred.

W. B. K.

The resolution adopted by the Socialist Party by a vote of 201 to 33 reads as follows:

"Resolved, That this convention (held May 30, 1905), do elect delegates as a committee to meet a like number of delegates from the Socialist Labor Party, to confer on the best means of



uniting all the workers in one vast army for progress. That a committee be elected to consist of three delegates from each of the four dominant counties, viz., Hudson, Essex, Passaic and Union. Nominations for this committee follow: For Hudson, Headley, Kiehn and Plymouth; for Essex, James, Killingbeck and Green; for Passaic, Glanz, Gregory and Hueck; and for Union, Bretschneider, Deiderick and Brickerood."

## II.

Jersey City, Sept. 28, 1905.

Mr. W. B. Killingbeck, Sec'y State Committee, Socialist Party of New Jersey, Orange, N. J.:

Dear Sir—Your communication of September 10, 1905, requesting that this committee take steps toward the election of a committee by the Socialist Labor Party of New Jersey to meet with a committee already elected by your organization, for the purpose of discussing the feasibility of a union of forces, was acted upon by the State Executive Committee at a meeting held September 27. An answer to your letter was drawn up by our committee, and it has been submitted to a referendum vote of the party, and the vote is now being taken. The following is our proposed answer in full:

We have first to inform you that the Socialist Labor Party of New Jersey is not an autonomous body. It is a limb of the Socialist Labor Party of the country. But while we cannot decide anything ultimately upon the subject which you have raised, still we see no reason why we should not confer with you as you have suggested, especially so in the light of recent developments in the Labor movement. So important are these developments in their bearing upon the matter which you have brought to us, that it may not be out of place for us to briefly touch upon them here.

Socialists are agreed that political institutions are the reflex of economic conditions. That given feudalism, an institution based on land ownership, the landlord class will rule the politico-social system. That likewise given capitalism, the class which owns the capital will, and of necessity must, wield the political power. It follows that the political manifestation of Socialism must also have an economic groundwork.

Heretofore the economic, class conscious groundwork upon which alone Socialism can be built, has been missing. Craft unionism has split the workers apart, has kept them apart, and in so doing craft unionism became the handmaid of capitalism. What should have been a solid economic foundation became under craft unionism a disrupted economic bottom, with which political unity was out of the question. But, happily, this is evidently about to be changed. The Industrial Workers of the World have organized upon a national basis the class-conscious union that can and must unify the workers. Political unity of the workers will, we consider, soon be a reflex of these changed conditions. The bedrock of economic unity now in process of shaping will, we believe, furnish the solid ground for the political unity of all bona fide Socialists.

We take it that your invitation, supported by a vote of your members, 201 to 33, is a symptom of these important changes, a sign of the recognition that now at last the ground is becoming solid for Socialist political unity. Thus interpreting your invitation we hail it as a sign of progress, and we shall be glad to confer with you and ascertain whether our interpretation of your move is correct, although, as we have stated in the opening of this letter, our State organization can do nothing definite without the National organization. Such a conference, however, taking place at a time when the hitherto divided Socialists are approaching one another and joining hands on the basis of the Industrial Workers of the World, such a conference, we feel



confident, at least feel hopeful, will promote the desired end of Socialist unity.

This is our proposed answer in full. Further action by this committee will depend upon the fiat of the party membership. Shall advise you the result of the referendum vote.

Yours truly,

State Executive Committee, Socialist Labor Party of New Jersey.

Per John Hossack, Sec'y.

N. B. The proposition to elect delegates to meet delegates of the Socialist Party in conference, was submitted to the membership of the Socialist Labor Party, and was carried by a vote of 79 for, to 2 against.

## THE CONFERENCES.

### First Conference.

The first meeting of the Conference committees, elected by the Socialist Party and Socialist Labor Party of New Jersey, was held at Socialist Party headquarters, Newark, Sunday, December 17, 1905.

The Socialist Party committee consisted of: Headley, Kiehn, and Reilly, from Hudson County; James, Killingbeck, and Green, from Essex County; Glanz, Hueck and Gregory, from Passaic County; Bretschneider, Cassens and Wilson, from Union County.

The Socialist Labor Party committee consisted of: Eck, Jacobs, and Hossack, from Hudson County; Quinlan, Johnson, and Rapp, from Essex County; Frueh, Schmitter and Romary, from Passaic County; Bernhard Burgholz, Fallath, and McGarry, from Union County.

Killingbeck of the Socialist Party called the meeting to order. Organization was perfected by electing Headley, of the Socialist Party, as chairman, and Frueh, of the Socialist Labor Party, as vice-chairman, of the Conference.

Two official secretaries were elected: Reilly, for the Socialist Party, and Hossack, for the Socialist Labor Party.

Rules to govern the proceedings were adopted. They provide: for opening the sessions at 2 p. m. and closing at 5 p. m.; that if any members cannot be present, alternates regularly elected, may serve; for limiting discussion to members of Conference Committees unless by vote the Conference permits others to speak; for a time limit of ten minutes in speaking, no member to speak twice upon one subject so long as a member who has not



spoken desires the floor. No matter pertaining to the Conference to be given out for publication during the life of the Conference, except by authority of the Conference, and then such reports for publication must bear the signatures of the secretaries of the Conference. All votes to be by show of hands.

After the adoption of the rules, Hossack, S. L. P., in order to bring something definite before the meeting read the invitation from the Socialist Party and the Socialist Labor Party answer thereto.

Reilly, S. P., said that the S. L. P. members were laboring under a misapprehension if they thought the Socialist Party of New Jersey an autonomous body, as it is not.

Eck, S. L. P., asked if any official statement had been made to the S. L. P. answer, as that answer really defined the S. L. P. position. He was informed that no answer had been drawn up.

Killingbeck, S. P., defined what he considered his Party's position on the trades union movement. He declared that the Socialist Party is, so to speak, purely a political organization. It extended sympathy to the A. F. of L., I. W. W., or any other trade union organization; but, as a political party, it should take no part in trade union conflicts. He thought the economic movement should be kept apart from the political movement, but stated that such tactics might be changed. Killingbeck then read the Socialist Party Trade Union resolution of 1904. He also read from the Preamble of I. W. W., that clause which speaks of the non-affiliation of the economic movement with political movement.

Eck, S. L. P., pointed out that a Socialist party that took no notice of—no part in working class economics, was a contradiction.

Reilly, S. P., declared that to assure the political triumph of the working class it is necessary to have an economic organization to take over the industries.

Quinlan, S. L. P., said it is not possible to organize the workers

on the political field, if they cannot first be united on the economic. Cited instances of English labor party men, voting at odds on a hour bill, because in one field they had day's work, in another field piece work.

Wilson, S. P. The condition of labor in this country is most lamentable and craft unionism is responsible for it. Industrial unionism looms up and the A. F. of L. has got to go. Through the A. F. of L. the S. L. P. failed to dominate the union movement. A Socialist trade union should dominate the political movement. It is commendable. At the downfall of capitalism something will be needed to save society from chaos, and that something must be a united and class conscious economic organization of the workers of the world. We must have such an organization to take and hold the industries to supply ourselves with food and other necessities when overthrowing the capitalist class. Economic organization must be capable of teaching and organizing the workers of the world to the end that victory may not mean defeat.

The trusts have a program to play in the labor movement. The steel trust has had the steel crafts to declare for trust policy, in opposition to the interests of their fellow workers. The progress of Industrial economic organization is essential for Socialist success. Let us arrange to further that. There is no hope unless we batter down existing structures.

James, S. P., spoke of experience in pure and simple unionism and said that to look to it for furthering Socialism is a hopeless task. He had attended an I. W. W. meeting in Newark, which pure and simplers tried to disrupt and partially succeeded, which was in glaring contrast to the present Conference, which had met calmly to discuss and learn from each other. He despaired of anything through union men.

Hossack, S. L. P., asked if it was not the same material to whom we must appeal on the political field and if so, how could he hope to accomplish there what he despaired of in the economic



mic field. The answer was that the unorganized workingmen were better material.

McGarry, S. L. P., arose to speak, and was asked by Killingbeck to define the non-political affiliation clause in the I. W. W. Preamble. McGarry said he was not a past master but explained that the finale of the Socialist movement is not merely to overthrow the capitalist class politically. The purpose is to do them up where their real power lies—economically, and it is in the economic field that the workers must primarily be united.

Kiehn, S. P., said that the stumbling block is the craft form of unionism. Industrialism is the best fitted to promote class consciousness. Holds that more S. P. than S. L. P. men are in I. W. W. now. Everything should be done to help the movement along.

Glanz, S. P., said he felt free to say that there was a difference of opinion in the Socialist party as to what should be the party trade union policy. Some believe in A. F. of L. Some had stood for A. L. U. and some advocated I. W. W. Some again were without economic belief, but he held, that without class conscious economic organization of labor Socialism cannot be accomplished.

Industrial Unionism believes in and advances to the Co-operative Commonwealth. Craft unionism is of and believes in capitalism. He had joined the union of his trade pursuant to resolution of the Indianapolis convention, only to find his hands tied and even though on Executive Board could do nothing for Socialism. Had witnessed instances of corruption in the union, and cited details.

Frueh, S. L. P., arose to suggest that as several of the S. P. comrades had touched upon such matters as party-owned press, discipline and kindred topics, in addition to trades unionism and as these were grounds of difference between the two parties, they should be noted and discussed separately.

Green, S. P., said that while he belonged to a pure and simple union, yet he favored I. W. W. He said Socialists were blamed

as union wreckers, whatever fate befell the A. F. of L. it had but itself to blame.

Schmitter, S. L. P., set forth the I. W. W. position.

The hour for adjournment having arrived, it was resolved that at future meetings the topics for discussion be in the following order:

Trades Unionism.

Party Press.

Party Discipline.

The conference then adjourned to meet Sunday, December 31, 9 p. m., at same place, 239 Washington street, Newark.

During the proceedings the best of good feeling prevailed. The members of both committees addressed each other as comrades, the spectators gave close attention and were in evident sympathy with the purposes of the meeting.

After the adjournment the crowd broke up into groups and the discussion that way lasted for an hour longer. The prevailing—practically the unanimous—sentiment was: there must be one united party of Socialism.

JAMES M. REILLY,

Secretary for S. P.

JOHN HOSSACK,

Secretary for S. L. P.

### Second Conference.

The second meeting of the Conference committees, elected by the Socialist Party and Socialist Labor Party of New Jersey, was held at Socialist Party headquarters, Newark, December 31, 1905.

Officers of the Conference in their places.

Roll call.

### SOCIALIST PARTY:

Essex County—Killingbeck, Green, James.

Hudson County—Headley, Reilly, Wilson.



## NEW JERSEY UNITY CONFERENCE.

Passaic County—Glanz, Gregory, Hueck.

Union County—Bickerood, Cassens, Walker.

## SOCIALIST LABOR PARTY:

Essex County—Mattick, Quinlan, Rapp.

Hudson County—Eck, Gallo, Hossack.

Passaic County—Frueh, Romary, Schmitter.

Union County—B. Burgholz, Fallath, McGarry.

Minutes of the first meeting, held December 17, were read, adopted, and, by unanimous vote of the Conference, ordered sent to the Socialist press for publication.

Eck, S. L. P.—Offered the following plan as a guide to intelligent discussion, which was adopted:

## On Trade Union Attitude.

First—The possibility of the true political proletarian movement, i. e., the political Socialist movement remaining neutral of trade unionism.

Second—The usefulness of the American Federation of Labor to the true proletarian movement, i. e., the Socialist movement.

Third—The usefulness of the Industrial Workers of the World to the true proletarian movement, i. e., the Socialist movement.

Reilly, S. P.—There can be no Socialist neutrality on the economic question. As Socialists we know the defects of pure and simple unionism. Comrade Debs stated a truth, when he said that to suit the capitalists, there could not be too many such unions. Industrial class-conscious unionism is certainly far superior. The question for us is what action should we take.

Glanz, S. P.—The general impression is that the Socialist Party is supposed to be neutral on the economic question, but the party adopted a trade union resolution at the 1904 National Convention, which proves it is not neutral.

Reilly, S. P.—Yes, and its phraseology is practically an endorsement of the A. F. of L. Our sentiment is said to be neutral, but that resolution was really a slap at the A. L. U.

## NEW JERSEY UNITY CONFERENCE.

Glanz, S. P.—Well, the resolution called upon the party members to join the unions of their trades. I contend it did not call for us to support the A. F. of L. alone, but all unions, A. L. U. as well as A. F. of L.

Eck, S. L. P.—Is not that a contradiction? The A. F. of L. favors and promotes capitalism, the A. L. U. was against capitalism. How could you favor both?

Walker, S. P.—The Socialist Party is not neutral to economic organizations of labor. To be neutral means to knife somebody in the back. Twenty-three years' experience in A. F. of L. has taught me that a craft union looks out for itself alone and doesn't give a tinker's damn for the rest of the working class. The Socialist Party cannot stand for that kind of thing and still be a weapon of the working class. The Socialist Labor Party does not wish neutrality, they get in, and work also, on the economic field. It means trouble, and decreasing membership, perhaps. The S. T. & L. A. was a mistake, we are here to learn from the mistakes, and remedy them. Only the future can tell as to the I. W. W. I had looked forward with hope to the Chicago Convention but from reading the proceedings and the speeches my hopes were blasted; but even yet this organization may succeed. No country so much needs a bona fide, class-conscious organization of labor. If the I. W. W. proceeds rightly using the strike as a last resort and educating the workers how to vote, there should be but one political party of Socialism. Two Socialist parties make the movement a laughing stock to the capitalists. The S. P. and the S. L. P. practically occupy the same position at present since the advent of a form of unionism that is free from a political party.

Quinlan, S. L. P.—Is not the Socialist Party trade union resolution merely a recommendation to the members and therefore without force?

Voice on S. P. side—"Yes, that is all."

Gallo, S. L. P.—A Socialist political movement cannot be



neutral with regard to economic movements. The Socialist Party itself, on the speaker's banners, says to the workers: "Join the union of your craft, join the party of your class." Evolution forced the S. T. & L. A.—the class-conscious, economic organization of labor. It was not a mistake. It organized with 25,000 men and to-day we have the I. W. W. with 100,000 men, organized on class-conscious lines. If it was a mistake, it was the kind of mistake that helps. Neutrality is nonsense. The S. P. stood by the miners in the coal strike, was that neutrality? It failed though to tell them that they were organized on wrong lines. The class struggle is being pretty well understood to-day. We have got to organize the workers as a class. The ballot alone is not sufficient. Witness the Hearst affair as proof.

Killingbeck, S. P.—I believe that political success, without economic backing, is possible. I don't say it is best but I do say it is possible. Eighty per cent. of the workers are not organized. There is a big field for us without touching the trade union movement. A comrade says that the I. W. W. is a result of S. T. & L. A. teachings. I want to say that Debs' Woodstock experience had just as much to do with it. The I. W. W. has been organized because of the lesson of the mistakes of the organization that preceded it, and undoubtedly along true Socialist lines. There is not a member of the Socialist Party but believes that the I. W. W. has the true form of organization. While, however, we may favor it as individuals, we should not as a party. There are millions outside of the unions who also need to be saved from capitalism. Comrade De Leon says we can build up a purely political movement, but that the day of its victory would be the day of its defeat, unless it had economic backing. Now I hold that it is utterly impossible for a body of men like the S. P. to talk without inculcating economics in the working class. If the S. P. progresses along its present road the economic end will take care of itself. We are told 100,000 men are in the I. W. W., there are twice 100,000 in the A. F. of L. who believe in the same thing,

Industrial Unionism. It is our duty as individuals to do what we can for the economic efforts of the workers, but we should take no chances of wrecking our splendid political movement by endorsing an economic organization that absolutely refuses to endorse us.

Headley, S. P. (Chairman)—Neutrality means standing idly by taking no interest one way or another. The S. P. is willing to assist in organizing the working class to its best interests. Neutrality is impossible, it really ought to be cut out of the discussion.

Eck, S. L. P. —In Germany, at Socialist Congress after Socialist Congress, this same question comes up. There the Socialist political movement dominates the economic, and because the unions are organized on Socialist lines the government is trying to organize craft unions and divide the workers. The "Wall Street Journal" has well said that A. F. of L. unionism is the greatest obstacle to Socialism in the United States. Comrade Killingbeck says 200,000 men in the A. F. of L. believe in Industrial Unionism, what of that? In the German army are millions who believe in Socialism, but that does not stamp that army as Socialist. Craft autonomous unionism kills the class instinct, therefore the A. F. of L. cannot be of us. The I. W. W. is organized on class lines, it is controlled by acknowledged Socialists. The W. F. of M. is its backbone, and they have fought better battles, and more successfully, than any other union in the country. The S. P. says—don't interfere as between these, one our enemy, the other our friend—it says aid both.

Eck then said S. P. men had been frightened by the mention of De Leon's name, as children were frightened by bugaboos. He would not quote him, but would quote one whom they favored, Kautsky.

Eck then read from "Neu Zeit" utterances of K. Kautsky in support of his argument. Eck claimed it would be easier to take away our votes, than to take away arms from European



workmen. So long as we pin our faith to the ballot alone, capitalists will let it slowly grow to tickle us.

Wilson, S. P.—I would like to ask before taking the floor: Does S. L. P. delegation think that object of conference will be lost unless indorsement of I. W. W. is agreed upon?

S. L. P.—A voice: No.

Frueh, S. L. P.—The S. L. P. has not officially indorsed the I. W. W.

Glanz, S. P.—One S. L. P. man says the S. T. & L. A. started with 25,000 men, at the Chicago Convention it had fourteen delegates, representing 1,400 members, now he says they have 100,000. Who does he mean by we?

Gallo, S. L. P.—The I. W. W.

Headley, S. P.—Is it understood that we are to favor Industrial Unionism instead of craft unionism?

Frueh, S. L. P.—The point is this, the I. W. W. gets S. L. P. support because of its Socialist principles, while the organizations we oppose stand for the present system, which system both the S. P. and the S. L. P. want to overthrow.

Hossack, S. L. P.—It seems to me that the first clause of the topic for discussion has really been disposed of. From what our S. P. comrades have said I believe that they understand that Socialists cannot remain neutral with regard to economic organizations of labor. I think we should now proceed to consider the second clause.

Killingbeck, S. P.—I offer this resolution: Resolved, That it is the sense of this conference that a political organization of the working class should at all times be interested in furthering the welfare of the workers, and that it is not possible for a true political movement to remain neutral of the economic movement.

Seconded.

Walker, S. P.—It should be incorporated there, that as Socialists we recognize at all times the necessity of standing by

the working class in economic struggles.

Frueh, S. L. P.—I favor changing the wording to read a progressive Socialist organization cannot ignore the economic movement.

Hossack, S. L. P.—After the word progressive, add political.

Walker, S. P.—Give us something more tangible.

Here there followed a number of suggestions as to how the resolution should be worded.

Glanz, S. P.—We must know just what we are doing. We have three elements in the S. P., I. W. W., A. F. of L., and those who hold that economic organization is not necessary for establishment of Socialism. We want to place ourselves in such a position that those who join the Socialist movement will understand that position, and that we are in favor of industrial economic organization. We are opposed to all craft organizations, knowing that they are enemies of the working class.

Gallo, S. L. P.—I offer as a substitute for the whole the following: Resolved, That the Socialist political movement of the working class cannot remain neutral to the organized effort of the working class to better their economic conditions on class-conscious, revolutionary lines. Seconded.

James, S. P.—It is well known that the S. P. side is weak as compared to the S. L. P. and I move that Comrade Carless be allowed to speak for us. Not seconded, and strongly objected to by Killingbeck, S. P.

The question was then called for on the motion by Gallo, which was accepted in place of the previous one, and the vote on its adoption was S. L. P., twelve for, S. P., ten for, two against, or twenty-two to two.

The discussion then proceeded to the second clause of the motion, defining the order of the topics for discussion.

Walker, S. P.—Lay it on the table.

Killingbeck, S. P.—Offered the following: Resolved, That it be the sense of this conference that the A. F. of L. be organized at



present, is detrimental to the interests of the working class. Seconded.

Frueh, S. L. P.—I would amend: We are opposed to the principles of the A. F. of L. form of organization.

Romary, S. L. P.—I would amend to read that the A. F. of L. form of organization and its principles are an obstacle to working class emancipation. Seconded.

The vote on this motion, as amended by Romary, was unanimously in favor.

The discussion then proceeded to the third clause.

Green, S. P.—It is my opinion that the S. P. should now go on record as indorsing the I. W. W. in opposition to the A. F. of L. We all believe in the new organization.

Quinlan, S. L. P.—The I. W. W. is O. K.; so was the S. T. & L. A. The A. F. of L. is in politics now. In New York it advises union men to vote for legislators favoring the eight hour law. These same men will also vote for the very judges who will declare the law, if it goes through, unconstitutional. The kind of organization we favor should be plainly stated.

Killingbeck, S. P.—I would offer this resolution: Resolved, That it be the sense of this conference that the organization of the working class on the economic field should be along the lines of industrial unionism, and that we recommend to all members of the Socialist parties to help build up a class-conscious labor organization. Seconded by Green.

Walker, S. P.—Craft organization has never yet been a friend of the working class. I remember when we had the Hunger Parade here, that the unions met to consider the conditions that confronted us and what did we find? We found Democratic heelers in the unions trying to have resolutions passed thanking the Democratic Party for its kindness to the workers, and Republican heelers in the same unions, boosting resolutions thanking the Republican Party for free soup. The Socialists put the whole thing on the rogues' gallery voting against all the resolutions. I recol-

lect that the blue stone cutters dropped out of the thing because their union didn't pay them \$3 per day for the time they were attending meetings with the avowed purpose of getting something for starving working people. We can't go forward to Socialism if opposed by craft unionism.

Wilson, S. P.—I am pleased with the progress made. Neutrality means compromise, negation, and ends in impotence. We are evolving from the morass of sentimentality on to the hard battleground of the Socialist revolution, and this is progress. I take it that the Socialist, scientific Socialist position, in its philosophy is a positive one. And it is this positiveness that makes militant Socialists of us. Having in mind the battle ground, constructive Socialism, you must have the class-conscious co-operation of the working class. Without it, your political program may go up in the air. In the past we have frittered away too much time with organizations that would not be class-conscious. Industrial Unionism implies the defeat, the downfall of craft organization. It means fight, the same as it did with the S. T. & L. A. and S. L. P. But we cannot be passive. The fight opens the way for Socialist thought to dominate. If there was any hope in craft unionism Socialism would not be compelled to do this. Craft unionism is hopeless; while industrial unionism we know opens the door to Socialist teaching, and provides a vast field for our agitation to become busy in. We must, therefore, logically recognize and welcome the I. W. W. as an organization, as allies and fellow-builders of the Workingmen's Republic. This is the most important move we can make here. It eventually means that we commit ourselves from the policy of laissez faire and sentimentality to militant, revolutionary Socialism. As I said, I am glad we have gotten along so far, and I hope something practical will be presented to rally together and unite the forces of Socialism.

Reilly, S. P.—Some Socialists speak as if Samuel Gompers is the A. F. of L. One great evil as exemplified in the A. F. of L.

812673



is the lack of spirit of the rank and file. If the Socialist spirit existed in the organization, a Gompers, no, nor a hundred Gompers could not stop it, and yet I have known of a union that refused to join the A. F. of L. because the Federation was too radical. Theoretically I can see it is the craft conflicts, the close shop, the high dues, etc., that kill the class spirit, and leaves little time for anything but discussion of petty interests. The I. W. W. with its uniformity, its easy transfer, is superior, and it does away with the necessity of boring from within. If the S. P. and S. L. P. unite nationally, perhaps some S. P. member will break. Some will split. I don't favor any compromise that would bring unity without a split. Only in a full and free discussion can we decide what is best to do.

Glanz, S. P.—In regard to indorsing the I. W. W., while I favor its principles, I am opposed to indorsing it. Who can say if a year from to-day the I. W. W. will be officered by Socialists? It might be that the officers would be Republicans or Democrats. What would become of such indorsement then?

A voice, S. L. P. side—Our support would be quickly withdrawn. The important thing is that the organization is to-day based upon the principles of the class struggle.

Gallo, S. L. P.—I hope that fear of a split will not deter the members of the Socialist Party from putting themselves on record in favor of the truth, and I would amend the resolution under discussion to read: Resolved, That this Conference places itself on record as favoring the organization of the working class upon the lines of the class struggle as laid down by the I. W. W. and we call upon all militant Socialists to ally themselves with the I. W. W. Seconded by Eck. The mover of the amendment, and the seconder, accepted an amendment to the amendment, cutting out all the words that follow the word struggle.

At this point the hour of adjournment was near and some on the S. P. side were anxious to vote or to prolong the session until a vote could be reached.

Frueh, S. L. P.—No vote should be taken until each matter is thoroughly thrashed out. I am willing to come here three or four times, if necessary, to clear up one point. We seem to be of one mind upon the proposition, but the proposition may not be entirely clear upon all of our minds. The S. L. P. has not, as yet, indorsed the I. W. W. and we certainly won't ask you to do what we have not done ourselves. We should be absolutely clear upon what we do. The important thing is that you support a class-conscious, revolutionary organization. The I. W. W. is opposed to the Republican, Democratic—the capitalist system. It is organized for the overthrow of the present system. Having declared for that, it is a Socialist organization. We who are Socialists should be in the vanguard of the labor movement.

Walker, S. P.—Upholds Frueh's idea of being sure of what we do at this time.

Killingbeck, S. P.—If we adopt the amendment it means disaster. Our party will split. It will not be a slight split but a break up of that entire Socialist organization. I would appeal to the progressive trades unions which are to-day considering the A. F. of L. throughout the land. I would not antagonize even the A. F. of L. and this is the only basis upon which we can ever agree. We believe in democracy in such things, and we fight for the goal. If we tie ourselves to that resolution it means a bigger fight.

The hands of the clock showed the hour of five, the time to adjourn the session.

Glanz, S. P.—Wanted the session to sit till midnight if necessary as it was to our interest to settle the matter there and then. He was satisfied it could be done.

Various motions to extend time were voted down on recommendation of Frueh that we stick to the rules.

The Conference then adjourned to meet January 21, to then take up the proceedings where they were left off.

The Conference adjourned with the feeling on both sides that



the two delegations had soberly and seriously labored to reach solid ground for the unity of the Socialist forces.

JAMES M. REILLY,

Secretary for S. P.

JOHN HOSSACK.

Secretary for S. L. P.

### Third Conference.

The third meeting of the Conference committees, elected by the Socialist Party and the Socialist Labor Party of New Jersey, was held at Socialist Party headquarters, Newark, January 21, 1906. Officers of the Conference in their places.

Roll call.

#### SOCIALIST PARTY:

Essex County—Green, Killingbeck, James.

Hudson County—Headley, Kiehn, Reilly.

Passaic County—Glanz, Gregory, Hueck.

Union County—Bickerood, Cassens, Walker.

#### SOCIALIST LABOR PARTY.

Essex County—Mattick, Quinlan, Rapp.

Hudson County—Eck, Gallo, Hossack.

Passaic County—Frueh, Romary, Schmitter.

Union County—B. Burgholz, Fallath, McCrorie.

Minutes of the previous meeting, of December 31, 1905, were read, adopted, and, by unanimous vote of the Conference, ordered sent to the Socialist press for publication. Business was then resumed, where it had been left off at the previous meeting.

Frueh, S. L. P.—Called attention to the fact that the Conference at its previous meeting had departed from the order of business which had been laid down. "The amended resolution which we now take up reads: 'Resolved, That this Conference places itself on record as favoring the organization of the working class upon the lines of the class struggle.' This is really a

sliding away from clause 3 of the order of business, in which we decided to declare for or against the: 'Usefulness of the Industrial Workers of the World to the true proletarian movement, that is, the Socialist movement.' " Frueh offered as a substitute for the amended resolution: Resolved, That the Conference places itself on record as recognizing the usefulness of the Industrial Workers of the World to the proletarian movement, that is to the Socialist movement. Seconded by Rapp, S. L. P., and by unanimous vote the substitute motion supplanted the previous motion, and amendment, and became the basis for discussion.

Killingbeck, S. P.—Amended to read recognize the usefulness of a form of organization similar to the I. W. W. Seconded by Quinlan, S. L. P.

Hossack, S. L. P.—This amendment dodges the question. Pure and simple might organize on what they would call similar lines. The A. F. of L. claims it has organizations on Industrial lines. According to the order of business we must pronounce for or against the I. W. W.

Eck, S. L. P.—I see no sense in the amendment. We should discuss what is now the original motion. An amendment is not in order until we have discussed the merits of the I. W. W. If the discussion brings out that the I. W. W. is not worthy of our confidence then the amendment may be justifiable.

Killingbeck, S. P.—The I. W. W. may be good enough now, but it may drift—may become bad. Should the Socialist movement base itself on the I. W. W. and that organization fall, the party would fall with it. I am opposed to recognizing that organization until it has proved itself to be of use. In Colorado the Western Federation of Miners adopted declarations similar to those of the I. W. W., endorsed the S. P., then went to the polls, not to cast their ballot for the Socialist candidate, but for a reactionary Democrat. We have nothing definite to show that the I. W. W. would not do the same thing. At the same time I believe in endorsing the principles of Industrial Unionism.



James, S. P.—I don't fully agree with Comrade Killingley. The point of endorsement should be discussed by a national convention. I would have this Conference declare that the members of both parties should join the I. W. W. and try to keep on class-conscious, Socialist lines. It would not be fair to ask to do what the S. L. P. has not done.

Eck, S. L. P.—We have decided to declare for or against I. W. W., and the discussion should be held down to that. I can say what we think of the I. W. W.

Headley, S. P. (chairman)—We cannot endorse, but we recognize the usefulness of the I. W. W. Let us drop using word endorsement.

Reilly, S. P.—We have the power to favor endorsement if we wish. As a local can recommend to the party, so can we recommend to the national organization, the recognition of the I. W. W. as a body useful to the movement. To recognize implies endorsement. We have said that the A. F. of L. is an obstacle to working class progress. Now the I. W. W. is organized on the basis of the class struggle and certainly a body so organized useful to the political movement and we do recognize that. The I. W. W. has for its goal the overthrow of capitalism. No Socialist at this late date but knows that the emancipation of the working class must be the work of the working class, on the economic as well as on the political field. The opposition to this motion may be divided into two groups. First, those who think that the political movement is all sufficient to bring about the Socialist Commonwealth. We have had instances enough to show that the political is not all sufficient. Why, even reforms cannot be brought about by political action alone. The argument cited against the W. F. of M. doesn't hold good when we consider the facts. Don't forget that the leaders and the radical men among the miners were deported to Kansas. Don't forget that in Colorado the ballots cast by the miners were counted by the same class that had deported the men to Kansas. Who of us can say

how the men voted? On the face of the returns a Democrat was elected, but even he was not allowed to take his seat. Let us not put too much faith in the ballot. In Germany we see the working class building barricades in the streets in defence of the suffrage. Here race prejudice has been played upon in order to disfranchise a whole class. Right here in New Jersey we see them getting ready to gerrymander the State again. Residence and other qualifications are surely working toward our disfranchisement. Let us not pin all our faith to what can be so easily manipulated. The Socialist state will be different to the capitalist state and we must be prepared to administer it. Unionism and politics are inseparable and the form of unionism is reflected by the political action of its members. Here in the East it was the K. of L., radicals that gave support to the "radical" Populist movement. Craft autonomous unionism produces individual political action—craft political action.

The I. W. W. is an economic organization based upon the class struggle; don't pick out its little defects. Its ground principles are correct, its aim is correct, and the movement is bound to result in a sound form of political manifestation.

The second group, maybe the majority, among us, recognize all this but they fear the fight, or that the time is not ripe. Well, if not now, when?—to quote Patrick Henry, when will we be stronger, will it be next week or next year? I say let us lay the foundation now, take our stand and not wait. I have seen the result of some of our doctrines, and you may call this De Leonism if you wish, we have built up a big organization, a big vote; that vote has been cut into, and will continue to be cut into by reforms. The question that should be settled in our minds is not to be afraid, but to declare it, if you see the usefulness of an economic organization with aims the same as ours, calling, despite us, for the unity of the workers politically and economically. If you recognize it as such—dare to say so.

Romary, S. L. P.—I can confirm by experience what Comrade



Reilly has said about Colorado. I lived in that state for three years, and took active part in its politics for the S. L. P. There the ruling class has absolute control of the political power. Here we can have watchers at the polls, but in Colorado minority parties are not permitted to have watchers at the polls at all. You cannot cite the election returns as proof that the miners did or did not vote as they said they would.

We should take a positive position, it is the only way for militant Socialists. Suppose that upon the platform or in the shop we point out the fallacies of craft unionism, and tell the workers that they should be organized upon the lines of the class struggle, in industrial organization, and they should ask if there is such an organization, what else could you do but point to the I. W. W.? If you really mean what you say, then have the courage to take the only stand that we can—that we dare.

Hueck, S. P.—Killingbeck's amendment is really a beating about the bush. We came out against neutrality and the A. F. of L., and what shall we do now?—go right before the people with an endorsement of the I. W. W. The majority of the workers are in favor of industrial unionism. In the shop I talk it, and when a fellow worker asks if there is such an organization, I say yes, the I. W. W. Therefore, I can't see how we can get away from saying it here, and we should say it. When we say industrial unionism let it be clearly understood that we mean the I. W. W. and no other organization.

Killingbeck, S. P.—I don't like my amendment any better than the rest do. It isn't quite the thing, and I would amend the amendment with the following:

That it be the sense of this Conference that an economic organization of the working class to be effective must be based on the class struggle along industrial lines and having for its object the abolition of the capitalist system and the inauguration of a Socialist Co-operative Commonwealth. Seconded.

Gallo, S. L. P.—The trade union question is the vital point of difference between the two parties. You have all, no doubt, read various so-called labor journals, that declare there is harmony of interest between employer and employe. As to the character of the I. W. W., let me quote from its paper, the "Industrial Worker." Gallo here read several paragraphs from the paper showing its class conscious utterances, and said the A. F. of L. journals do not publish such utterances. Gallo also read from the Weekly People extracts of Debs' address on Industrial Unionism, and said that the organization that sends out men to preach such doctrine, and issues papers to teach such doctrine, clearly establishes the character of the organization, and its usefulness to the Socialist movement. As long as the capitalists let us have the ballot; let us make the most of it. The I. W. W. recognizes that, and, while it does not indorse a political party, it proclaims the fact that we have to unite on that field as well as on the economic. Let us so organize that come what may we are ready to take and hold the means of production. As Reilly says, the ballot can be taken away. So in time of peace prepare for war. The S. P. side should recognize that this conference must be logical in all its conclusions and resolutions. Let us meet the issue like men by yes or no.

Green, S. P.—I have already expressed my belief in the I. W. W. I also regret that our press ignored Comrade Debs and his speeches. I am in favor of unity, and what I now bring up, is not for antagonism, but I want to read this from The People. Objection by Walker that it was not relevant to the discussion. Objection sustained by the chair.

Romary, S. L. P.—I believe in the necessity of full discussion. I. W. W. failure is not an improbability. If it fails, it can only be through failure to apply the principle. Even so, what of that? The principle will live. In Russia the revolution appears to be temporarily crushed, yet no Socialist entertains the thought that the revolution is ended or lost.



Let us make a fight for right principles. I. W. W. principles are right. Until we have developed organization able to overthrow capitalism we cannot overthrow it. Capitalism could not overthrow feudalism, until itself had reached the development of power able to cope with it. So with the I. W. W. With us we are now developing within capitalist society the power to grapple with it. All past systems show the necessity of us rearing an economic organization to establish Socialism.

Glanz, S. P.—There is but one course for us to pursue. Socialists know that there are but two forms of unionism worthy of our consideration, the A. F. of L. and the I. W. W. Having condemned the A. F. of L. we cannot remain logical by declaring that the I. W. W. is useful to the working class. We should endorse it. I have been told that they have Industrial Unionism in the Building Trades, but that is not what we mean. I am in favor of striking out usefulness and saying endorsed.

Quinlan, S. L. P.—I seconded Killingbeck's amendment because of the lack of a motion as suggested now. We ought to substitute the word endorse for usefulness. Then the comrades on both sides of the house would not be in a dilemma. There is Industrial Unionism and Industrial Unionism.

Frueh, S. L. P.—The resolution simply calls attention to the matter under consideration—the usefulness of the I. W. W. and declares that we recognize its usefulness. This is not an official endorsement but yet is an actual endorsement of the I. W. W.

Walker, S. P.—I personally believe it would be a wise course for both of us to eliminate all reference to any particular organization and endorse the principles for which we stand, that is, Industrial Unionism. We must realize that we are only twelve men on each side. I believe the amendment to the amendment, recognizing the usefulness of the I. W. W., or organization based upon the lines of industrial unionism, should be passed here, and not any direct endorsement. Would the I. W. W. accept such endorsement? The S. L. P. has not endorsed the

I. W. W. officially. Why should we go ahead of our national organizations? I believe both the political and economic movements are necessary and should be kept separate. I was in the A. F. of L. and it was not until 1896 that we asked the I. W. W. to even endorse us, and then stipulated that it was a matter of feeling and respect for us. In this country the first principle is, "we want to live," and to live we must conform to certain ideas that are in vogue. If we openly endorse the I. W. W. it means hardship for some of our men. The A. F. of L. today is the pet, the child, practically, of the capitalist class in this country. In cities where they have control of the trades it means we will be ostracized. I don't care for the threats of a split by some; I would have a half dozen splits if necessary to get rid of some of them. In the matter of endorsing, we have no power and should not go beyond our national organizations.

Dick, S. L. P.—Let us get clear. This conference has no power to endorse or not to endorse. We are here to find ground upon which political unity can be brought about. We can only recommend to our state organizations, and if they approve, to our national organizations. The I. W. W. would not be able to accept a direct endorsement; by recognizing its usefulness we practically endorse it. We have decided that we cannot remain neutral; we have also decided that the A. F. of L. is an obstruction to a class conscious movement. This brings us to the usefulness of the I. W. W. If nothing abominably rotten can be found in it, we must recognize its usefulness. All men, including the workers, are inclined to organization. The capitalists recognize this and have manipulated the trade union movement by having the fakirs on deck. We ought also to be on deck to organize the workers along right lines. "Big Six" strike gets, not sympathy, but opposition, from other crafts. The Franklin Society of pressmen knocked them. In this typo strike unionists on the papers are setting articles knocking their striking brothers. If organized upon the basis of the I. W. W. this



could not be. Talk about voting in Colorado—conditions are just as bad here. At last election it was not until I had four times demanded them that I got a complete set of ballots. By and by they will have a man sitting there to decide whether or not we have the intelligence to vote.

James, S. P.—I would like to ask if there is any truth in the stories that I. W. W. men are scabbing on the printers?

Eck, S. L. P.—No. In the Butterick plant there is an I. W. W. engineer, and the I. W. W. wrote "Big Six" that if called upon to aid the strike the I. W. W. would order him out. (Applause by both sides.)

Question called for by S. P. side only. Hossack, S. L. P., called attention to the fact that while others wished to be heard a vote should not be taken. He had noticed that Comrade Kiehn, of the S. P. side, had tried to get the floor but failed.

Kiehn, S. P.—I wish to say but few words, and in favor of the amendment. Recognizing any particular organization means endorsement, and means we would endorse their mistakes on the economic field. It's different in the old country. Last year all the organizations in the transportation industry in Germany came to a three years agreement to effect perfect amalgamation to control industry in that line. The main thing is that all four organizations are already organized on the lines of the class struggle. I am not in favor of recognizing any particular organization, only just the idea expressed in industrial unionism. I notice that the I. W. W. has already made mistakes. I was a delegate to the Chicago Convention, and there expressed my views as to why I would not try to get the organization I represented—the 'longshoremen—to join them. The I. W. W. has made mistakes since. I judge of an organization by the actions of the men in control rather than by their mere words. Two or three pages of by-laws, adopted by no one, were printed and presented to the membership of the I. W. W. The lines of the organization are not clear, there was a compromise between fac-

tions. They have made mistakes but we know they have the right idea.

Killingbeck, S. P.—As Comrade Kiehn says, the I. W. W. have made mistakes, and if we endorse them we would endorse, would have to assume, responsibility for these mistakes. In my opinion there were too many professors at their convention. There was a "father" there, one of the leading spirits of that organization, in whom no confidence should be placed. He betrayed the S. P. and is capable of betraying the I. W. W. With the downfall of economic organization would come the downfall of the political organization. We endorse the features of industrial unionism, that is why I presented the amendment. I hope you will vote down the original motion.

Frueh, S. L. P.—It seems to me that to vote for the amendment is running away from the question. A Socialist can desire nothing better than unity, on both the economic and political fields. You will not succeed while divided. We realize that the ballot is a useful thing. We agree that we should come together. Two political parties are a hindrance to success. In order to come together we must agree on the trade union position to be taken. Really, the sole difference between us is the trade union question. If you vote for the amendment you will have decided nothing, you will have simply said, yes, we believe in an economic organization based on the class struggle. As for the I. W. W. not being perfection, I challenge any one to produce a perfect organization, an ideal one. If we cannot, then we must accept that which comes nearest to it. In the economic field we have the A. F. of L. and kindred organizations which stand for the present system, and on the other hand the I. W. W., opposed to the present system. It stands for the same principle as you—for the overthrow of capitalism. We must stand together upon the trade union policy to be pursued in the future. If you find the A. F. of L. acceptable to you, stand by it. If you find the I. W. W. acceptable, you must stand by it. If it is



the best thing offered at the present time you will have say it is the organization you will support. The S. L. P. has not officially recognized the I. W. W., but actually it has done so. We ask the S. P. to do the same. The S. L. P. is practically a unit upon the I. W. W. If in a year from now the I. W. W. goes wrong we can say so then. Why unite now and educate the working class? By keeping separate it tends to keep the workers apart. We want unity, and the I. W. W. wants the same thing. It is said the working class does not want Socialism; they are ready for it now—if we will but get together and enlighten them. As to political action, let us grant that the capitalist class put no obstacles in your way, and you win, the first thing you will have to do will be to organize industry. If we could under such favorable circumstances win, wouldn't it be a big advantage to have the proper organization ready? But to the extent that you cannot depend upon political measures, to that extent, the economic organization becomes the more important.

Quinlan, S. L. P.—Will Comrade Kiehn explain what he means by something similar, something just as good?

Kiehn, S. P.—I do not understand the question. I spoke in favor of the amendment. The sense of the amendment is to favor economic organization of the workers upon industrial lines. I want to avoid the designation of any particular organization.

Schmitter, S. L. P.—Comrade Kiehn is the only one to say anything against the I. W. W. It is fair to admit that certain features in it are not just what they should be. The S. P. and the S. L. P. have made mistakes, and having seen them endeavored to remedy them. Kiehn's argument does not hold water against this young organization.

The question on the amendment to the amendment being called for by both sides it was put to a vote with the result:

S. P., three for, nine against.

S. L. P., twelve against.

On the amendment to the motion it was lost by a vote of twenty-four to nothing.

The original motion then being put the vote was:

S. P., ten for, two against.

S. L. P., twelve for, nothing against; or twenty-two for, two against.

The passage of the motion was greeted by hearty applause on both sides. Killingbeck, S. P., asked that he and Kiehn, S. P., be recorded as voting against the resolution.

The hour for adjournment having arrived it was decided, on motion by Glanz, S. P., that the next meeting be held in Second Ward Labor Lyceum, 100 Sheridan street, Paterson, Sunday, February 4; 2 p. m.

The same feeling of mutual comradeship that characterized the previous sessions of the Conference, and the same earnest effort after light, so as to ascertain the solid ground on which militant Socialists can unite for a united political front against the parties of capitalism characterized this third session.

JAMES M. REILLY,

Secretary for S. P.

JOHN HOSSACK,

Secretary for S. L. P.

#### Fourth Conference.

The fourth meeting of the Conference committees, elected by the Socialist Party and Socialist Labor Party of New Jersey, was held at Second Ward Labor Lyceum, Paterson, February 4, 1900.

Officers of the Conference in their places.

Roll call. SOCIALIST PARTY:

Essex County—James, Killingbeck, De Yonga.

Hudson County—Headley, Kiehn, Reilly.



Passaic County—Glanz, Gregory, Hueck.

Union County—Cassens, Walker, De Mott.

#### SOCIALIST LABOR PARTY:

Essex County—Mattick, Rapp, Quinlan.

Hudson County—Eck, Hossack, Koettgen.

Passaic County—Frueh, Romary, Schmitter.

Union County—B. Burgholz, Fallath, McGarry.

Minutes of the previous meeting, January 21, read, adopted and by unanimous vote ordered sent to the Socialist press publication.

Party Press, the next topic on the order of business, then came up for discussion.

Eck, S. L. P.—Offered the following as a guide to discussion  
**The Press of the Movement.**

#### Section I.

No. 1 Private ownership of such a press.

No. 2. That which constitutes private ownership.

No. 3. The possible control of such a press by the bona fide working class movement, i. e., the Socialist movement.

#### Section II.

No. 1. Party ownership of the Press.

No. 2. That which constitutes Party ownership.

No. 3. The possibility of the control of such a press by the bona fide working class movement, i. e., the Socialist movement.

That this plan of discussion be adopted was seconded by Killenbeck, S. P.

Reilly, S. P.—I don't see the necessity for dissecting this question so minutely. It was all right to go into detail in the matter of tactics with regard to economic organization, on that topic we had three sub-divisions while here we have more. Socialists of both parties favor the ownership and control of the press of the movement by the Party. We understand what we mean

when we say Party ownership, and I am in favor of declaring for absolute ownership and control of the press by the Party. Of course discussion is needed, but we don't need to go into it in a way that will prolong our work unnecessarily. We know well enough that what the Party doesn't own it can't control.

Glanz, S. P.—I am opposed to discussion on these lines on the same ground as Comrade Reilly. We Socialists are now pretty well grounded on the fact that the party ought to own and control its press. Unless you want to discuss it this way for propaganda, we should get right down to business.

Schmitter, S. L. P.—It may not appear on the face of it that such a close discussion is necessary, but with the past in mind there is certainly a lesson for us to learn. This question was the real cause of the split, and I think a thorough discussion is necessary so that in future no such split can take place again. Throughout the country there is need that all be entirely clear upon this subject. It may be that the S. P. doesn't really believe in Party ownership of the press. As an actual fact it can be demonstrated that a privately owned press can scuttle the movement, and we must certainly put aside anything that can scuttle the Socialist movement. The privately owned press will tell us that we here are the ones who would scuttle the movement, but you know, and we know, that we are not here for that purpose, but that on the contrary our sole wish is to uphold Socialism. I think the discussion is in order.

Eck, S. L. P.—Comrade Reilly says it will prolong the discussion. If there be no other reason I should still stand for it, and just for the reason that we want to get at the bottom of the matter. The S. P. men, too, I think, take the same position—in favor of a thorough and systematic discussion.

Headley, S. P. (Chairman)—The words party press mean so little and yet mean so much. We have papers that claim to be the party press, yet are not. If the only question was as to what we do favor, five minutes would settle it. The S. P. of New



Jersey have declared in favor of a party press. We should discuss methods of ownership, and handling, and instead of lumping it all together I think we should take up as suggested by Comrade Eck.

James, S. P.—Comrade Headley has expressed my view. If it takes six weeks let us thrash it out thoroughly. There is no use in cutting off the discussion, because some think that favoring a party owned press settles the question. We want to know just what we are voting for.

Killingbeck, S. P.—I seconded Comrade Eck's plan because sometimes the longest way round is the quickest way home. I think we can arrive at a decision quicker by systematic discussion than if we wander all over the field.

Eck's plan was adopted by a vote of twenty-two for, two against.

Killingbeck, S. P.—This question of Party Press, to some of the older party members, is more, far more difficult to decide, than it is to new members. On both sides we have had experience with party owned press. I first joined the S. D. P., and under the Party constitution every member got the "Social Democratic Herald" free. We thought we had a Party owned press, yet the result was disastrous to the Party. In a year's time we found that the press owned us. The editor, or a bunch of editors, through reaching the Party each week practically controlled the S. D. P., and what doctrines they choose to promulgate the majority swore to as gospel according to Marx, Engels, etc. Well, that Party owned press, as I said, proved far more disastrous than the present form of individual owned papers.

To-day a Berger may promulgate his views in the "Herald," but we have an antidote in Mailly's Toledo "Socialist." (A voice: What is the antidote to Mailly?) If you can't swallow Berger, why, resort to Mailly (general laughter.) Imagine what it would mean to-day, if the S. D. "Herald" was a Party owned

paper with Berger as editor, and that paper was going to every member of the Party! The result would be that we would be following in the footsteps of Hearst, Colby & Co., for that is where Berger is going to-day.

I want to refer to the so-called party owned press of the S. L. P. side. I know from personal contact with good Socialists that they are frequently misled by the Party owned press of the S. L. P. They accept what De Leon says as gospel truth—that things in The People are absolute gospel. We know, and the S. L. P. knows, that there have been communications put in The People that were not really the truth, they were exaggerated or distorted, but because the paper represents the S. L. P. whatever appeared in the paper is taken with the authority of gospel truth, and there is the danger of a party owned press. Let us have a press in which every member has the right to have his individual opinion published in full. It may be impracticable to do that, I am not newspaper man enough to say.

Reilly, S. P.—What De Leon chooses to publish or not to publish matters not here. One thing is sure his Socialism is true and I think The People has represented the S. L. P. I don't believe that The People controls the S. L. P. I believe the Party controls the paper and that is just what we want. The dangers that have been talked about appear trivial. When I talk for the Party, I am, so to speak, owned by the Party. If what I say is not in harmony with the party they take me off the stump. We had a case where that was done in Hudson County. Now, if it is advisable that the Party should control my utterances on the stump, where my influence is of a much less degree than that of an editor, who reaches a greater number of people and much oftener, is it not much more important that he also should be under absolute party control? I believe that the S. L. P. has control of The People, but from time to time I have heard stories, of which I know not the truth, but they are to this effect: The Daily People plant is leased to a private



concern and the publication of the paper is a mere incident that De Leon, so goes the story, has everything so arranged in his own hands that he can hold the paper and his job of editor in spite of anything that the party might do. I have heard a lot more to the same effect, and I should like to know from the S. L. P. comrades just how The People is party owned; who holds the title; what remedy has a party member who thinks he has been unjustly suppressed, to whom can he go? I recollect that a while ago there was a suit for libel brought against the S. L. P. as the owner of The People and a verdict was given against the party. If De Leon, as is said, owns the paper, how does he fix it that the party owns the libels?

Comrades, the dangers from party ownership are largely imaginary. Under party ownership Berger couldn't pursue his present course—you cannot imagine him being editor under such circumstances, he simply wouldn't be the editor. As it is now he can practically do just as he pleases.

Eck, S. L. P.—The two previous speakers have wandered from the subject somewhat. Now, I don't think there is a man in this Conference, or one in this hall, who is in favor of a privately owned Socialist press and it would seem that discussion on that is ended. I would therefore move the following resolution.

Resolved, That this Conference places itself on record as being opposed to all privately owned papers espousing the cause of labor, i. e., the Socialist cause.

Seconded by Romary, S. L. P.

Hossack, S. L. P.—Before this motion is put I would call attention to the fact that Comrade Reilly has asked some very pertinent questions as to The People, and I think, if it is not declared out of order, that those questions should be answered.

Point of order raised and sustained by the Chair.

Killingbeck, S. P.—I want to put one matter correctly. The Chairman stated that we in New Jersey had decided against a privately owned press; true, but we could not decide that no

one had a right to publish a Socialist paper, which is a different thing.

Headley, S. P. (Chairman)—That goes without saying. If I favor one thing, then I must be against its opposite. If I favor party ownership of the press, then I am against any individual of the party publishing a Socialist paper.

Kiehn, S. P.—I want to know if all this discussion is really necessary? I fail to see why it is. How to own and control the press is the only question. We here in New Jersey have decided for party ownership, and so have the S. L. P.—long since. The question is how to control the editors.

Frueh, S. L. P.—Let us not forget that we are now speaking of what constitutes a basis for unity. We are speaking of what is needed to unite the Socialist forces of the country. I do not understand by party press, the press of New Jersey. Thus far the discussion shows that the dangers from a privately owned press are much greater than any disadvantage from a party owned press. I am convinced that party ownership is the thing. If greater advantages can be shown for private ownership let us hear them.

Glanz, S. P.—There should not be any difficulty in settling this question. We who demand the collective ownership of the means of production should certainly collectively own the means for the dissemination of Socialist principles and information. If an editor is elected and what he writes does not suit, does not express the views of the party ours will be the fault if we don't kick him out. We have seen some of the results of private ownership. It was only in the last campaign in New York that we saw Berger and Wilshire attacking the comrades and the party platform, and such action was practically an endorsement of the Hearst movement. There is no one that can prove to me that De Leon ever betrayed the S. L. P. as Berger and Wilshire have the S. P. Whatever faults The People may have the S. L. P. is responsible for them, and before we can lay



anything at De Leon's door it will have to be proven. I have heard stories similar to those heard by Comrade Reilly. One of the rumors I heard some <sup>ne</sup> time ago was from a New York S. L. P. comrade and it was to the effect that Richard K. Fox owns and controls the Daily People. I told the comrade that repeat the yarn that if he would bring me the proof I would see that it got into S. L. P. hands. Well, he hasn't got back with it yet. (Laughter.)

Eck, S. L. P.—As Comrade Glanz says, we who are collectivists cannot consistently balk at collective ownership of our press, the press of the movement.

The question being called for by both sides, it was put and carried by unanimous vote: Resolved, That this Conference place itself on record as being opposed to all privately owned papers espousing the cause of labor, i. e., the Socialist cause.

Eck., S. L. P.—We are now to discuss what constitutes private ownership and this is a very important point. Take the "Volkszeitung" corporation, for instance; any S. P. party member can become a stockholder, he may afterward develop into a sorehead against the party, but he still remains a stockholder in the corporation, still remains in a position where he can vent his soreness on the party and do it damage. A stock corporation within the party is not party ownership. I am not anxious to offer all the resolutions, but as no one else does, I offer this:

Resolved, That this Conference places itself on record as looking upon all papers as privately owned, the property of which is not vested directly in the party through a committee or source designated by the party for such purpose. Seconded.

Killingbeck, S. P.—Some of you can remember when we had a united party, and owned a party press. The time came when some objected to the way things were going. A large minority, or was it the majority, broke away from the S. L. P. The matter was taken into the courts, where it dragged for a long time,

Meanwhile two "Peoples" were issued. At a convention in Worcester, Mass., we had one side tearing up one "People," the other side tearing up the other "People," until we were wading deep in "Peoples," and it took the police force to keep order. That was one result of party ownership. Who did, from a moral standpoint, if we can speak of a moral standpoint in the Socialist movement, who did own The People?—the so-called Kangaroo faction or the S. L. P. faction? Through the capitalist courts the so-called Kangaroo faction lost the name of the party and the party name as well. Mind you, this was the work of the capitalist courts. I hope the S. L. P. side won't take offense; I am quoting historical facts. Some of us might say along Comrade Eck's line of reasoning that The People became a privately owned press. Was that minority soreheads?

Eck, S. L. P.—I did not say that they were or were not soreheads. I merely supposed such a case. I supposed that a gathering of men in the party started a paper and refused to stand by the party, what then? As to the facts of 1899; which side stood by the party's official declaration, when in 1896 the party declared in favor of the S. T. & L. A.? It was this that was the bone of contention. The party press stood by the party's decree, the William Street corporation opposed it, and it was this that caused the split.

Reilly, S. P.—Comrade Killingbeck says the 1899 split was caused by the party owned press. I wasn't in the movement then, but from what I have read and heard, from both sides, my conclusion is that the split was forced by the privately owned press, because they realized, yes, saw, that a party owned press was coming, and that certainly meant that the privately owned press would have to go.

Quinlan, S. L. P.—Is Comrade Killingbeck sure as to which side it was that took the fight into the capitalist courts? As a matter of fact it was not the S. L. P., it was the privately owned press that sought the capitalist courts.



anything at De Leon's door it will have to be proven. I have heard stories similar to those heard by Comrade Reilly. One of the rumors I heard some time ago was from a New York S. L. P. comrade and it was to the effect that Richard K. Fox owns and controls the Daily People. I told the comrade that repeated the yarn that if he would bring me the proof I would see that it got into S. L. P. hands. Well, he hasn't got back with it yet. (Laughter.)

Eck, S. L. P.—As Comrade Glanz says, we who are collectivists cannot consistently balk at collective ownership of our press, the press of the movement.

The question being called for by both sides, it was put and carried by unanimous vote: Resolved, That this Conference places itself on record as being opposed to all privately owned papers espousing the cause of labor, i. e., the Socialist cause.

Eck, S. L. P.—We are now to discuss what constitutes private ownership and this is a very important point. Take the "Volkszeitung" corporation, for instance; any S. P. party member can become a stockholder, he may afterward develop into a sorehead against the party, but he still remains a stockholder in the corporation, still remains in a position where he can vent his soreness on the party and do it damage. A stock corporation within the party is not party ownership. I am not anxious to offer all the resolutions, but as no one else does, I offer this:

Resolved, That this Conference places itself on record as looking upon all papers as privately owned, the property of which is not vested directly in the party through a committee or source designated by the party for such purpose. Seconded.

Killingbeck, S. P.—Some of you can remember when we had a united party, and owned a party press. The time came when some objected to the way things were going. A large minority, or was it the majority, broke away from the S. L. P. The matter was taken into the courts, where it dragged for a long time,

meanwhile two "Peoples" were issued. At a convention in Worcester, Mass., we had one side tearing up one "People," the other side tearing up the other "People," until we were wading knee deep in "Peoples," and it took the police force to keep order. That was one result of party ownership. Who did, from a moral standpoint, if we can speak of a moral standpoint in the Socialist movement, who did own The People?—the so-called Kangaroo faction or the S. L. P. faction? Through the capitalist courts the so-called Kangaroo faction lost the name of the paper and the party name as well. Mind you, this was the work of the capitalist courts. I hope the S. L. P. side won't take offense; I am quoting historical facts. Some of us might say along Comrade Eck's line of reasoning that The People became a privately owned press. Was that minority soreheads?

Eck, S. L. P.—I did not say that they were or were not soreheads. I merely supposed such a case. I supposed that a gathering of men in the party started a paper and refused to stand by the party, what then? As to the facts of 1899; which side stood by the party's official declaration, when in 1896 the party declared in favor of the S. T. & L. A.? It was this that was the bone of contention. The party press stood by the party's decree, the William Street corporation opposed it, and it was this that caused the split.

Reilly, S. P.—Comrade Killingbeck says the 1899 split was caused by the party owned press. I wasn't in the movement then, but from what I have read and heard, from both sides, my conclusion is that the split was forced by the privately owned press, because they realized, yes, saw, that a party owned press was coming, and that certainly meant that the privately owned press would have to go.

Quinlan, S. L. P.—Is Comrade Killingbeck sure as to which side it was that took the fight into the capitalist courts? As a matter of fact it was not the S. L. P., it was the privately owned press that sought the capitalist courts.



Walker, S. P.—We are discussing 1899, this is 1906. The true history of 1899 has not yet been written, may never be. The Socialists of this country since 1899 have been guilty of some of the grossest blunders ever perpetrated. I believe the split of 1899 was not necessary, and had both sides been animated by true Socialist sentiment it could not have occurred. I know that the *Volkszeitung* has been guilty of a good many mistakes like other papers, but we should not forget that it went into its pockets and spent thousands of dollars up to 1899 to keep *The People* going. In '99 the split was not on the question of a privately owned press, it was a question of tactics. The editor of *The People* took a certain position, the directors of the *Volkszeitung* took another. That caused the split. It is an open question if a party owned press is feasible at the present time. When the movement is thoroughly organized and the spirit of discipline is thoroughly enforced then a privately owned press will be a crime. It's risky putting up money for a party owned press. We don't know how it will result, and we may be pouring money into a hole. De Leon once said that the more papers you print the greater the loss. He said it would be impossible to get advertising for the *Daily People*, while it would be easy to get ads. for a Hungarian, German or other language Socialist paper. The press referendum in this State did not really express the sentiment of all the party members. When the time comes let us have a party owned press, until then the question should be left open and the best paper will survive. Those that make any cracks against Socialism will go down. It will be suicide for them to say anything against the movement. In party ownership the danger is that only three or four per cent of the membership will take active interest. From bitter experience I know it is hard to control the press. Look at our "Bulletin" to-day—a little paper for the purpose of giving us the party news, it is certainly party owned, but its chief use is as a place where official dirty linen is washed. Until we are

strong enough to establish it we should not have a party owned press, meanwhile if *The People*, or the "Worker," or any other paper comes nearest the Socialist ideal you will see its subscription list go up. We are here to put ourselves on record for political unity.

Glanz, S. P.—As I understand it, the resolution means that all papers must be under the N. E. C.?

Eck, S. L. P.—Not exactly that. All papers whose property is not vested in the national party organization are private papers. In the S. L. P. no member, committee, or section of the party, can publish a paper without the sanction of the N. E. C., and then all the property of such a paper as far as practicable must be vested in the N. E. C., free from any financial or legal liability, the election of the editor being subject to the approval of the N. E. C.

Glanz, S. P.—In West Hoboken we have a little paper owned by the local; under the resolution that would be a private paper?

Eck, S. L. P.—Ownership by a local is not strong enough. A local might be pulled away from the party, and then its paper could be used as a club against the party.

McGarry, S. L. P.—I would like to see embodied in the resolution that ownership must be vested in the national organization as there is just as much danger of a state pulling away.

Walker, S. P.—I would amend by saying that we place ourselves on record as advocating a party press owned and controlled by the party.

Seconded by James, S. P.

Eck, S. L. P.—Let us not try to dissolve it away. We want to state what really constitutes private ownership.

Schmitter, S. L. P.—I must agree with Comrade Eck as to making proper definitions and distinctions. Comrade Walker has stated that the *Volkszeitung* laid out thousands of dollars for *The People*: say that it has; where did it get it? It got it from the movement and for that very purpose. We have



been told for years that the members of the Volkszeitung corporation had to be members of the party and that this was a guarantee of the party control of the press. Some stockholders, they claimed, did not and would not belong to the party, but they said the bulk of them did, but isn't it also true that to the extent that the non-party members held stock that they too exercised control? The Volkszeitung while acknowledging that it is not party owned claims to be the party press and true to the party. In one breath they tell us they are the party press, in the next they say they are a corporation. The split of 1899 occurred because the Volkszeitung corporation took a position in direct opposition to the party, and the party could do nothing. The party did not control the corporation, because it had the vested right. The party was helpless so far as control was concerned. We want to fix it so that there can be no squirming out in future.

Headley, S. P. (Chairman)—When an organization is formed in a new state it is necessary for it to apply to the national organization. When a new paper is to be published application for the power to do so must be made to the national organization.

Walker, S. P.—Comrades on the other side say the Volkszeitung claims to be a party paper. It never said that. To become a stockholder a man had to be a party member, though once out of the party he could still remain a stockholder.

Quinlan, S. L. P.—This pretending to be the party press puts me in mind of the yellow Journal. It proclaims itself the paper of the people, but you just try and get something into it that would be of interest and benefit to its readers, to the people, which, of course, means against the class for which the Journal stands, and you'll find out mighty quick whose paper it is. As to the Volkszeitung spending its money, the Socialist press, private or party, is only supported by us digging down in our pockets. It would be foolish to depend upon individual rivalry

to keep privately owned papers straight. If a person can become a stockholder of the Volkszeitung the way Comrade Walker states, what is to hinder men from joining the S. P. so they can become stockholders, and then, getting out of the party, do as they like with the paper?

Kiehn, S. P.—The amendment offered doesn't define the nature of the ownership. In America we have had little experience in party ownership, even the S. L. P. has owned but one paper. In Germany there have been differences of opinion between the editors of different but party owned papers and the press committee and party sentiment in general. The ownership of the press in capitalist society is not a security that we would control it. You could legally own it and yet not control it. The capitalist courts might shift the ownership to suit their purposes when the battle against capitalism is on. I don't see any guarantee of party control except dependence upon the individual integrity of those who at any time may be in charge of the paper. In Germany, the official organ of the party was in opposition to the general opinions of the party membership and the editors were forced to resign, and now opposition has developed within the party to the forcing of the resignation of the editors.

Koettgen, S. L. P.—I would like to ask the comrade: Does the party in Germany legally own the press?

Kiehn, S. P.—No, it is owned individually through the party organization.

Koettgen, S. L. P.—It was always impressed upon us that the Volkszeitung was the party press, but the time came when we found out that it was not. It was the party press when it needed funds; it was not the party press when the party called on it. The party at all hazards must own its press and we can't be too careful how we place its control. We have had some experience with the Daily People. It was first placed in the hands of three trustees and when their management was found unsatisfactory we found our hands tied and it took a general vote of the party



to dislodge the trustees. There is a warning for us in that. The national organization must be in control.

Quinlan, S. L. P.—Comrade Kiehn seems to think that an unincorporated body cannot own property. That is a mistake; such organizations can own property, and the S. L. P. owns property. Comrade Kiehn brings illustrations from Germany. I can bring some from England. The S. D. F. claims "Justice" as a party owned paper; well, it is owned by the Twentieth Century Company, and that is owned by Rosebery and his crowd. The "Labor Leader" of the I. L. P. until two years ago was owned by Keir Hardie, and through it Hardie dominated the I. L. P.; afterward he turned it over to a corporation of I. L. P. members. How the paper was sustained was a mystery to some. I remember when that paper was used to boom capitalist enterprises by articles describing Irish and Scotch scenery in the interest of hotels and railroads. I hear that the corporation publishing the paper has pulled away from the party. It is the same kind of trouble as we had here.

Kiehn, S. P.—I didn't intend to infer that I doubted the legality of the party owning anything. What I doubt is that the party can control the press when it does own it.

Killingbeck, S. P.—I would amend the amendment with the following: That it be the sense of this Conference that no paper or magazine shall be considered an official organ, unless it has the endorsement of the national organization and shall be owned by members of the party or by the national organization.

Seconded by Gregory, S. P.

Frueh, S. L. P.—I would call attention to the fact that this does not cover. The giving of consent to publish does not imply control of the paper by the body giving the consent. The important thing is that the property of the paper be vested in the national organization.

Quinlan, S. L. P.—Has any paper of the S. P. received the endorsement of the party?

Reilly, S. P.—No. The party cannot endorse any paper.

Question called for by both sides. The amendment to the amendment was lost by a vote of twenty-two to two; the amendment was lost by a vote of twenty to four; the original motion:

"Resolved, That this Conference places itself on record as looking upon all papers as privately owned, the property of which is not vested directly in the party through a committee or source designated by the party for such purpose" then being put, was carried by a vote of twenty-three to one, the S. L. P. votes being cast solidly each time.

The hour for adjournment having arrived the session was extended until six o'clock as the Conference had been nearly an hour late in opening.

Eck, S. L. P.—At this stage of our proceedings I think it well to call the attention of the Conference to a grave injustice that has been done this body, and the Socialist movement as a whole. I have here from the Volkszeitung what purports to be the minutes of our first meeting, as sent out for publication, bearing the names of the two secretaries which would convey the idea that it is official. I will read you a translation, and to any German who doubts the literalness of it, I am not only willing, but would like him to compare the two. (Eck read his translation, and no one controverted it. It was very evident that what the Volkszeitung had published was not the minutes of the Conference as authorized for publication, but a distorted summary). Eck asked: Did you, Comrade Reilly, give out or sign any such minutes as these?

Secretary Reilly—No, I did not!

Eck—Did you, Comrade Hossack, give out or sign any such minutes?

Secretary Hossack—No!

Eck—Did you, comrades of this Conference, authorize any such minutes as I have just read. (Cries of "No" from both sides.) An S. L. P. editor might do the same thing but we could put



him out. How else can we view this work of the *Volkszeitung* but as an attempt to mislead our German comrades? And isn't it pretty good evidence that we can't control a privately owned press? This Conference is anxious that its proceedings be truthfully put before the working class, and as the *Volkszeitung* has not done so, it has not done us alone an injustice: it has done it to its readers and to the working class movement. I have compared the full minutes as published in the "Worker," and find that, there also, here and there a word is missing, and the omission weakens the sense. It all goes to show how much control you have over the privately owned press.

Eck read portions from the "Worker" where discrepancies appeared.

McGarry, S. L. P.—Comrade Reilly has asked some questions here that I think Comrade Hossack can answer, and I would like to have them answered.

Point of order raised and sustained.

Reilly, S. P.—I think we have thrashed this out pretty well, and I would move that this Conference place itself on record as recognizing that the Socialist movement cannot control a privately owned press. Seconded.

The following amendment by Schmitter, S. L. P., was accepted as part of the motion:

"Resolved, That privately owned Socialist papers cannot be controlled by the true proletarian, political movement, i. e., the Socialist movement. But that contrarily such privately owned papers tend to control the movement.

Frueh, S. L. P.—While the original motion is all right I think the amendment makes it stronger because it points out that the movement will be a reflex of how its press is owned.

Gregory, S. P.—Thomas Jefferson said that he would rather have a press controlling the country than a government controlling the country. No other power wields such an influence in moulding opinions and ideas as the press. The modern press

controls public thought. The Socialist press can do the same. To me it is a very important question whether we should allow such a tremendous power to remain in the hands of a few individuals, to give them the power to mould the thoughts of their readers in whatever direction they may choose. All readers are more or less influenced by the manner in which papers are conducted, how they handle subjects.

Now whoever controls or influences my thoughts controls me, and the ignorance of the people to-day is due mainly to newspaper deception and trickery. We cannot be too careful on this matter of party press. Speakers on the street corner exert but little influence as compared to our papers which reach far greater audiences day by day or week by week, as the case may be. It is of the utmost importance that we here rightly decide into whose hands we should put the conducting of our papers, so that readers may get information and ideas and form opinions in strict accordance with that for which we stand.

Eck, S. L. P.—If the *Volkszeitung* did not control the German comrades by shutting off information from them, do you think the German comrades would stand for this sort of thing? (Holds up the *Volkszeitung* mutilation of minutes.)

Walker, S. P.—It is a mistake to be dragging the *Volkszeitung* Corporation into this Conference. At the last meeting I protested against an editorial from the People being read, yet nearly all our time to-day has been taken up fighting 184 William street, and in doing this you are making a grave mistake. I came into this Conference to unite the Socialist movement on the political field. Of course the *Volkszeitung* exercises an influence on its readers, all papers do. We are handicapped at the start; we are trying to overcome obstacles that are almost insurmountable. Don't keep dragging in the *Volkszeitung*. If you keep pounding them how can you expect them to publish your minutes. It is wrong to drag in The People too.

Reilly, S. P.—What Comrade Walker has said demonstrates



the importance of voting for the resolution. He says the Volkszeitung exerts an influence, therefore it is a big mistake to oppose it, which is proof enough that the S. P. cannot control the paper. Are we here to so shape our acts a certain way because we fear the minutes will be distasteful to the owners of that paper? Our resolution says that privately owned papers tend to control the party, and I think that what Comrade Walker has said proves the truth of it. We want to cut out all possibility of such a control over the party, and instead have the party exert a power over the press. Comrade Walker just asserted that we are handicapped at the start; if so, isn't it by this private press that controls our party membership? We must keep silent on private press so as not to offend their owners, he says. If they didn't control us we wouldn't need to fear offending them.

Glanz, S. P.—I can give an instance that bears that out. This morning a certain comrade came to the County Committee and asked what is being done at this Conference? I asked him if the Jewish paper had not published the report. He said No, and that they would not as they considered it against them. To me that proves conclusively that the privately owned press is even now using its influence against us, and that press has an influence upon our members. We should let them know that we recognize these facts whether they like it or not.

Frueh, S. L. P.—Comrade Walker talks as if the Volkszeitung was the issue, which is not so. The object of this Conference, having unity in view, is to see upon what points we agree, and, if on any we disagree, the reason why. In the discussion incidents of the past, names of men, and of papers, will be used, but only because they are germane to the subjects. If the conduct of The People can be proved the stumbling block to the movement, then let us say so; if it is the Volkzeitung, or any other paper, that is at fault let us say so. To do that isn't

a raking open of old sores. Remember it is unity we have in view and how to accomplish it.

James, S. P.—Judging from what Eck has read to us from certain papers, the only conclusion is that they garbled the minutes. Why did they? Because they wanted to influence their readers against our work. That kind of thing is underhanded work and proof to me that private ownership of the press is an injury to the Socialist movement. They had no right to change a word, especially not to change words so that the sense is upset. I notice in one place there it makes us look ridiculous. We have nothing to lose by voting for a party-owned press.

Killingbeck, S. P.—The party may own a press and that press may own the party too. You will remember that after the split in 1899 the S. D. P. and the so-called Kangaroo faction held a convention at Indianapolis for the purpose of union. So far as the convention was concerned we did unite, but the S. D. P. had a party-owned press. In its first issue after the convention closed, that party-owned press, under the influence of Stedman, Berger, Heath & Co. came out against the action of the convention, issued a manifesto against it and practically disrupted the unity. That press wielded such a power that it swayed the S. D. P. members against what their delegates had done at Indianapolis. The result was that we went into that national campaign with a Springfield faction, a Chicago faction and the S. L. P. While individual ownership may have its faults, party-ownership has more dangers; we won't have reached perfection when we have a party owned press.

Question called for by both sides, the resolution (This conference places itself on record as recognizing that the Socialist movement cannot control a privately owned press), with amendment (That privately owned Socialist papers cannot be controlled by the true proletarian political movement, i. e., the Socialist movement. But that, contrarily, such privately owned



papers tend to control the movement), being put to vote, was carried unanimously.

The meeting then adjourned to meet Sunday, February 18th 2 p. m., at Liberty Hall, Spring and Shippen streets, West Hoboken.

The Conference adjourned with the mutual recognition on both sides that the press of the movement is its greatest weapon and that whatever the difficulties arising from Party ownership of the press, they are trifling compared to what such difficulties become when the material interests of individual ownership sway them, or when designing or ambitious men control the private press. The Conference recognized that party ownership and control of the press of the movement are essential to the party safety.

JAMES M. REILLY,  
Secretary for S. P.

JOHN HOSSACK,  
Secretary for S. L. P.

#### Fifth Conference.

The fifth meeting of the Conference committees, elected by the Socialist Party and Socialist Labor Party of New Jersey, was held at Liberty Hall, West Hoboken, February 18, 1906.

Roll call.

#### SOCIALIST PARTY:

Essex County—James, Killingbeck, Wilson.

Hudson County—Kiehn, Headley, Reilly.

Passaic County—Glanz, Gregory, Hueck.

Union County—Cassens, Cull, Ufert.

#### SOCIALIST LABOR PARTY:

Essex County—Mattick, Quinlan, Rapp.

Hudson County—Eck, Gallo, Hossack.

Passaic County—Ball, Belzner, Schmitter.

Union County—B.Burgholz, Fallath, McGarry.

Vice-Chairman Frueh (S. L. P.) being absent, Eck (S. L. P.) was elected vice-chairman for the session.

Minutes of previous meeting read, and at request of Glanz (S. P.) correction made to the effect that the Jewish comrade who wanted to know what was being done at the Conference had inquired of the Passaic County Committee and not of Comrade Glanz as an individual. At request of Killingbeck (S. P.) that where Walker (S. P.) is quoted as saying "insurmountable obstacles" the word "almost" be inserted. These changes being made the minutes were adopted and ordered sent to the Socialist press for publication.

The regular work was then proceeded with.

Reilly, S. P.—When the discussion closed at the last meeting we had practically disposed of the question of party press. Comrade Hossack and myself went over the minutes very carefully and that is the conclusion we arrived at. The conference declared against private ownership of the press, defined what constitutes private ownership, and held that what the party does not own it cannot control. As Comrade Headley puts it, the logical deduction is that we must favor the opposite of that which we oppose. The order of business before us is Section II, under the head "The Press of the Movement," subdivided, first, party ownership; second, that which constitutes party ownership; third, the control of a party owned press. Comrade Hossack and myself have jointly prepared a resolution, which we think covers the essentials necessary to party ownership of the press. We submit this for your consideration:

"This Conference places itself on record with the following, as embodying, what in its judgment, constitutes and is essential to party ownership of the Socialist press: Resolved, That a party owned press is a press all the property of which is vested in the party national organization as an unincorporated body. Over a party owned press no one, who is not a member of the party, can exercise any control directly or indirectly, whether in edi-



torial, reportorial or administrative capacity; and over which none who ceases to be a member of the party can retain such control. We consider it essential to the safeguarding and purity of the party ownership of the press, that no member is free to start a political paper without previous sanction from the highest national executive body of the party, nor to own any share in any privately owned political paper."

Seconded by Schmitter (S. L. P.)

Reilly (continuing)—You will notice that this resolution is so framed that it makes the control of the press a power of the national organization. We want the press to be a national exponent of the movement, by this I mean that what is taught as Socialism in New Jersey must be the same as what is taught in Pennsylvania or any other state. In our party what is Socialism in one state is not Socialism in another state. The Social Democratic Herald, for instance, has one brand of Socialism, the Toledo Socialist has a different brand; we want just one brand all over the country. I suppose of course that everyone understands that the literary bureau comes within the scope of party press. In our party we have a literary bureau but it is inefficient for the reason that the energies of the party are diverted from it by other concerns—private concerns. We should stand for the principle that all the party channels for the dissemination of Socialist knowledge and information should be owned and controlled by the party.

Killingbeck, S. P.—That would mean then that Kerr & Co. and similar institutions would have to go out, and that Mailly and Wilshire could not publish papers.

Headley, S. P.—They'd get out quick enough, you wouldn't have to put them out.

Glanz, S. P.—Since the last Conference the question has been put to me as to whether it is possible to own a party press. I should like to ask from the S. L. P., if there is no objection, certain questions.

Is the S. L. P. incorporated?

Hossack, S. L. P.—No.

Glanz, S. P.—Is the Labor News Co. an auxiliary to the S. L. P.?

Hossack, S. L. P.—What do you mean by auxiliary? The Labor News Co. is the literary agency of the S. L. P. It publishes the leaflets and pamphlets of the party.

Glanz, S. P.—The S. L. P., not being incorporated, it cannot incur debts, therefore an auxiliary is necessary.

Hossack, S. L. P.—Then your question is: Does the Labor News Co. publish The People? No, it does not. The paper is published by the party and both the Labor News and The People are under one management.

Glanz, S. P.—Is the Labor News incorporated?

Hossack, S. L. P.—No.

Glanz, S. P.—As I understand it there has to be incorporation for a body to sue or be sued. How can you do business without being incorporated? How can you incur debts?

Hossack, S. L. P.—That is a matter that rests with your creditors, whether or not they consider you reliable. Now that this whole question has come up I should like to answer right here. Comrade Reilly having asked some questions at our last meeting, I came here to-day prepared to answer. I have here the documents in a case which the S. L. P. has on appeal before the Supreme Court of the State of New York. The defendant in the case is not the Daily People, Daniel De Leon or any other individual. The action was brought against the Socialist Labor Party, not through the National Secretary, but through the treasurer of the National Committee. The plaintiff, a former member of the party, in his complaint affirms that it is the S. L. P. that owns, publishes and conducts the Daily People.

(Hossack here read extracts from the documents and said): I don't ask you to take my word for it. If you want to know just how the Daily People is owned and conducted appoint a com-



mittee to go over and investigate. I can assure you that there is evidence enough to convince you that the S. L. P. owns the paper.

Kiehn, S. P.—There are some features of the resolution that I do not like, Comrade Reilly's resolution advocates a centralization of authority over the party press. Well, that can work two ways. It might work toward a pope or toward a democracy. If it is all to be owned by the party, yet be controlled by National Committee, sub-committee, press committee, its culmination will be that one individual will control it all. The party press should be under the membership in the locality where the paper is published. I don't see why our members should not own stock in any privately owned paper. I may be a member of a progressive labor organization which publishes a paper that I consider a Socialist paper; according to the resolution I should have to get out of the party or out of the organization for the reason that being a member I would be a stockholder of the paper.

Reilly, S. P.—A labor organization publishing a paper does not make that a political paper.

Killingbeck, S. P.—Would you consider the Socialist Review a national concern?

Eck, S. L. P.—In a sense I am a stockholder in the Daily People and the Industrial Worker, but only by virtue of membership, and only so long as I am a member of the respective organizations. These papers are not owned by any set of men, inside or outside of the organization. They are the property of the organizations. If I leave either organization there is nothing for me to take or hold, as my stockholding ends with loss of membership.

Kiehn, S. P.—I don't know where to draw the line between a political paper and a labor paper. A privately owned paper may support the party. A trade union paper may support the party ideas and I may have to be a member of that union to

make a living. Then I would be a stockholder and not eligible to membership in the party.

Headley, S. P.—We have already decided that the property of a Socialist paper shall be vested in the national organization. I don't see why ownership of labor papers should be brought up here.

Kiehn, S. P.—A political paper may be owned by a labor organization. We saw the official organ of the W. F. of M. supporting Adams for Governor. I might have to be a stockholder in such a paper.

Reilly, S. P.—A labor organization may by resolution endorse a political party but it still remains an economic organization. We have recognized the I. W. W. but that does not make us an economic organization. I am not a stockholder in the I. W. W. paper except through my membership. You might as well talk of stockholders in the Co-operative Commonwealth.

Ufert, S. P.—While I favor ownership by the party I don't think it feasible to vest all power in the national body. What can they know of the needs of various papers? I don't think it could be carried out. What do the comrades at our national headquarters know of the needs of a paper in San Francisco, for instance. It might be well to vest in national body ownership that cannot be vested in local bodies.

Headley, S. P.—We are talking to rather a long resolution. Let me suggest that we take it up in sections. Adopted.

The first section: This conference places itself on record with the following, as embodying, what in its judgment, constitutes and is essential to party ownership of the Socialist press: Resolved, That a party owned press is a press all the property of which is vested in the party national organization as an unincorporated body.

Unanimously adopted.

The second section: Over a party owned press no one, who is not a member of the party, can exercise any control directly



or indirectly, whether in editorial, reportorial or administrative capacity; and over which none who ceases to be a member of the party can retain such control.

Adopted unanimously.

The third section: We consider it essential to the safeguarding and purity of the party ownership of the press, that no member is free to start a political paper without previous sanction from the highest national executive body of the party.

Carried unanimously.

The fourth section: Nor to own any share in any privately owned political paper, caused further discussion.

Killingbeck, S. P.—While by my vote I have shown that I favor a party owned press, yet I should be extremely sorry to see the day when there would be no privately owned Socialist press. I think it is necessary for the safeguarding of the movement that there should be some privately owned Socialist papers. Comrades on both sides know that it is a few active members who control the movement and decide all the referendums—(Reilly, S. P.—Why shouldn't they?). We are going to have a large number of half-baked Socialists come into the movement in the near future. They will look upon a party owned press as god-like, as something not to be controverted. It will be possible for a few leaders to present their views in such a way as to get the endorsement of almost anything they present. Take the last half dozen referendums in our party, they carried while some of us thought them against the interests of the party. Members vote yes to save friction and trouble. I should be sorry for the day when there would be no independent press in which to present our views. This portion of the resolution would drive out of the movement every publisher of a postage stamp called a Socialist paper.

Headley, S. P. (Chairman)—You are talking on something we have already decided. We have declared against privately owned Socialist papers, and when we did that we practically prohibit-

ed members from holding stock in such papers, and this resolution merely aims to emphasize that.

Reilly, S. P.—In New Jersey the party won't allow me to get out campaign literature on my own initiative. Kerr & Co., Wilshire and other publishers are no better than I and they must be controlled the same as I.

Glanz, S. P.—As far as I am concerned, having decided the first part of the resolution we cannot take any other action except to adopt all of the resolution. We as members of the party will also be members of the co-operative organization that will publish the party press. The resolution says no member shall own a share in a privately owned press and that is right. If I should own a share in a privately owned press such as the Appeal to Reason, Wilshire's Magazine or Socialist Review, I would be acting inconsistently as a Socialist, for when we have party ownership the members must support that press alone and not foster competing papers.

Quinlan, S. L. P.—Those who have money enough to start private papers cannot be workingmen, and we are not seeking the philanthropy of anybody.

Headley, S. P.—I claim that having decided against a privately owned press we cannot logically favor anything pertaining to a privately owned press. If a member cannot publish such a paper, of course he cannot hold stock in one. There is no use in extending the argument, we have only to confirm previous action.

Ufert, S. P.—In 1899 it may have been that the editor of the paper ruled the party membership, but as the members to-day are more enlightened, better posted on party affairs, that former danger doesn't exist to the same extent.

Glanz, S. P.—I have heard the Labor Standard of Paterson referred to as a political paper. To cover objections that may be raised I think we ought to insert the word "Socialist" before



the word "political" making it read Socialist political papers and move that as an amendment. Seconded.

Hossack, S. L. P.—I think the resolution should carry as originally made. All this talk of workingmen owning stock in papers puts me in mind of the capitalist claim that workingmen, widows and orphans own the railroad stock. I doubt if there is a man here that could put up money enough to own stock in anything. We want to fix it so that no encouragement can be extended to any outside political papers by the party membership. As to managing the party press we don't expect that the N. E. C. is to write the editorials, nor rush around from town to town supervising it all. Control of the press is what we are after and that can only be secured by having the property vested in the party organization.

The amendment of Comrade Glanz being put, it was lost by a vote of seven to five in favor, S. P.; eight to four against, S. L. P.

The last clause of the resolution then being put it was carried: S. P., seven for, five against; S. L. P., twelve for.

Glanz, S. P.—We are now to take up Party Discipline and I would move the following: Resolved, That this conference places itself on record as being opposed to the form of organization commonly called state autonomy, now in vogue in the Socialist party. Seconded.

Glanz (continuing) said— Our organization is in a chaotic state. I need not refer to Berger, Milwaukee or other matters. The report of the National Quorum for 1902 gives evidence enough. Glanz read from the report to the effect that in new states inexperienced comrades set forth doctrines that lead to principles and tactics essentially middle class, and at variance with the utterances of the party. In such cases the national organization could not interfere until a split occurred in the state and it was appealed to. Independent interpretation of principles leads to this. This is the position we are placed in

with state autonomy and I think it is right and proper for us to condemn it.

Eck, S. L. P.—State autonomy is a reflex in the S. P. of craft autonomous unionism. The history of the country shows the same experiences with regard to the old doctrine of state rights. The question came up continually and continually divided the people until it culminated in the civil war. I don't know what can be said in favor of state autonomy. What do you mean by it, anyway?

Killingbeck, S. P.—State autonomy is the price we paid to Berger for the privilege of having him remain in the S. P. (Laughter.)

(Glanz resolution put and adopted unanimously.)

Eck, S. L. P.—I offer this as a resolution: Whereas, It is evident that the capitalists are thoroughly organized as a class, for the one purpose of exploiting the working class. This organization positively implies the further and ever further subjugation of the class that produces all wealth by the processes inherent in and inseparable from the capitalist mode of production, and tends to equalize the Caucasian workingman with the Chinese coolie; and

Whereas, The capitalist organizations, both economic and political, bow down to a rigid discipline for this purpose solely; therefore, be it

Resolved, By this Unity Conference that in view of the foregoing facts, it becomes self-evident that workingmen organized in either economic or political organizations must also bow down to a rigid self-imposed discipline with eyes forever fixed upon the opposite goal, that is, the complete emancipation of the working class by the overthrow of all the master classes. Seconded.

Hossack, S. L. P.—Party discipline means the power of the party's organization to hold its membership to strict obedience to the party's laws. You have heard that the S. L. P. is intolerant. Well its intolerance consists in this, that the party says



to its members you are here voluntarily and if you cannot accept the party's rules—why the world is wide. You may say that's it, it is submit or get out! Not at all. We have discussion within the party. We are not a lot of fossils, we recognize that discussion is natural and needful. Not only that, you will find that our party press is the medium for such discussion. Just at present those who differ with the party as to the I. W. W., there are one or two, are giving their views in *The People*. We are sticklers for one thing, though, and that is that no party member can go it alone and pretend to speak for the party. Discipline is a matter that really cannot be legislated upon; it consists in the spirit of an organization, and it is only possible in a body that is clear upon what it wants, and clear upon how to go about getting it. The S. L. P. has for its principle, down with capitalism, for its slogan, no compromise. It has this for New York, for Milwaukee, for San Francisco, in a word for the nation. It does not have different views for different localities. A transgression in San Francisco, for instance, is immediately, when brought to light, seen to be a transgression by the party everywhere, and will be disciplined by the party.

Discipline is really a reflex of whether the party's principles are loose or firm. If the principles are loose you will have all kinds of interpretations of them so that discipline will be impossible—unity of purpose and methods are essential to discipline.

As Socialists we know that surroundings make the man. A party of wobblers must naturally produce wobblers and consequently there can be no discipline there. Surrounded by wobblers, newcomers must also become wobblers, each member wobbles to suit himself, consequently discipline is unimaginable there.

The disciplinary power of the party lies not in any constitutional provision but in explicitness of party purpose.

Wilson, S. P.—So long as private views are allowed free play in a movement and the members are not drilled to submit to

self-imposed discipline for the benefit of the movement we will have trouble. It is the reformer type of mind, not the revolutionists that make the trouble in a Socialist organization and refuse obedience to well recognized rules. If not called to time it goes on from bad to worse. This lack of discipline is a sad feature in the S. P. We have evidence of it in Essex, especially since the beginning of this Conference. The fight is on there now against the militants. Individuals claiming the right of private views are disregarding the organization and exerting their energies against the party authority and the interests of the movement in general. To meet such cases injurious to the organization, discipline should be enforced rigidly. We must have it understood that there must be mutual obedience to party rules, and that discipline must be enforced.

Glanz, S. P.—How does the S. P. method of discipline differ from that of the S. L. P.?

Eck, S. L. P.—In the S. L. P. we endeavor to have the minds of all members clear upon the essential principles of the movement. In the measure in which we succeed in that, to that extent will discipline prevail. Discipline reflects the ideas of the party. If a man comes in ignorant of much that we would like him to know we don't blame him for that, but we try to clear him up. If he still sticks to some such nonsense, as Hearst is a Socialist, for instance, why the revolutionary party becomes intolerant. To tolerate freak notions destroys discipline. Discipline depends upon how you drill your man at the start.

Killingbeck, S. P.—For five years this question as to whether the individual or the party organization was supreme has agitated the S. P. The S. L. P. justly pride themselves on the discipline they maintain which has kept their organization a unit. The S. P. grew rapidly. Multitudes came in only to be led about by certain speakers, led into voting against what true Socialists considered right. In Essex we have had several experiences. There eloquent speakers gather in and command sufficient votes so



they can carry out reactionary policies. It is not true Socialist policy to have individuals run meetings and do business in individualistic way.

Eck's resolution was unanimously adopted.

Glanz, S. P.—Having now reached a basis upon which unity can be brought about the next thing to consider is how to accomplish it.

Hossack, S. L. P.—It strikes me that the first thing to do is sum up our findings. The question of unity is not peculiar to New Jersey alone. Pennsylvania, Colorado, and locally in a number of other places the question is agitating Socialist minds. The Socialist party of Maine in State convention on the fifteenth adopted a resolution which reads:

"Resolved, That the Socialist party of Maine in convention assembled, recognizing the necessity for working class unity and solidarity, do hereby endorse and commend the action of our New Jersey comrades in initiating the move for unity with the Socialist Labor Party, and we hereby recommend that our national organization take such steps as will pave the way for a thorough unification of the revolutionary Socialist forces upon such basis as will aid and strengthen the army of the proletarian revolution."

(Great applause from all parts of the hall.)

We have done a great work here; we have gone to the bottom of the matter, and upon what we have accomplished the comrades elsewhere can make their beginning. I would move that a committee be elected by the Conference to draw up a manifesto to be submitted to the next meeting, and then if adopted by the Conference to be sent to a referendum vote of our respective constituencies, and if carried there to be referred to our respective national organizations.

James, S. P.—I have thought a good bit over this. The rank and file of the S. P. are not going to vote intelligently unless we reach them in some way. Yesterday at Newark headquarters

it was said that we were led into a trap. I asked who set the trap? If trap there was, it was the S. P. State convention that laid it. One comrade, a reader of the Volkszeitung, who had been muddled by that paper, came here to-day to see for himself what goes on. To reach the members I favor this Conference resolving itself into a propaganda committee, so that those who will have to vote upon this question will have a chance to know all about it.

Headley, S. P.—I favor the Conference putting its findings before the membership. We cannot depend upon the private press. The Social Democratic Herald says we are a lot of tyros and dolts, the Worker intimates we are a lot of ignoramuses, that with honor or without, stand for sacrifice of principle to harmony.

Eck, S. L. P.—I second the propaganda plan and the committee should devise ways and means to reach the membership. The question is too serious not to be gravely considered by all.

Eck, Gallo, Hossack, S. L. P., and Glanz, James, Reilly, S. P., were elected on the committee to draw up a manifesto, and to consider ways and means for getting the entire proceedings of the Conference published in pamphlet form.

The Conference then adjourned to meet at S. P. headquarters, Newark, on March 4, 2 P. M.

If the spirit of earnest endeavor and thorough comradeship in the Conference was a marked feature of the previous sessions, it was even more marked at this session as the Conference is approaching the close of its labors and feels justified in the expectation that it is laying solid ground for ending war between men who should be at peace.

JAMES REILLY,

Secretary for S. P.

JOHN HOSSACK,

Secretary for S. L. P.



## Sixth Conference.

The sixth meeting of the Conference committees, elected by the Socialist Party and the Socialist Labor Party of New Jersey, was held at S. P. headquarters, Newark, March 4, 1906.

Officers in their places.

Roll call.

## SOCIALIST PARTY:

Essex County—Green, James, Killingbeck.

Hudson County—Headley, Reilly, Wilson.

Passaic County—Glanz, Hueck, Ullman.

Union County—Burgess, Cassens, Walker.

## SOCIALIST LABOR PARTY:

Essex County—Mattick, Rapp, Quinlan.

Hudson County—Eck, Gallo, Hossack.

Passaic County—Frueh, Oatley, Schmitter.

Union County—B. Burgholz, Fallath, McGarry.

Minutes of previous meeting adopted as read and ordered sent to the Socialist press for publication.

The committee of six elected at the previous meeting to draw up a document on the findings of the Conference and to devise ways and means for having the entire proceedings of the Conference published in pamphlet form reported as follows:

Your committee has held two meetings since the last session of the Conference, one February 25, the other March 3. As the result of our labors the committee by unanimous action presents for your consideration the manifesto which it has drawn up, and also makes the following recommendations:

On Ways and Means—That the Conference itself raise a fund for the publication in pamphlet form of its entire proceedings. We have prepared sixty subscription lists, so that if the plan is adopted work can be started at once to gather the funds, a rough estimate is that from \$150 to \$175 will be needed. We figure that the lists should be good for an average of \$2 each and that the sales from the pamphlet will make up any eventual deficit on

the lists. We recommend the election of a committee to carry out the publication of the proceedings, also the election of a financial secretary and a treasurer to handle the finances. We further advise that the Conference do not adjourn sine die until the work of publication has been completed, and the financial matters adjusted. It is also recommended that meetings to discuss the findings of the Conference be arranged between the S. P. locals and the S. L. P. sections in the various localities.

The report of the committee was received, and upon the manifesto being read by the secretary of the committee, McGarry, S. L. P., moved that it be adopted, seconded by Rapp, S. L. P.

Following is the manifesto in full:

The Conference of representatives of the Socialist Party and the Socialist Labor Party, of New Jersey, elected by a general vote of the membership of the Socialist Party and the Socialist Labor Party of the State, upon the initiative of the Socialist Party, to consider the causes of the division between the two camps, and ascertain, if possible, whether solid ground could be found for a union of the militant Socialist forces of the State, and thereby of the land, hereby makes its joint report to its two respective constituencies.

\* \* \*

We are happy to say that our conclusions have been unanimously arrived at, in many instances, and in all others by virtual unanimity.

It did not take the Conference long to be one as to the essential reasons for the present deplorable division, consequently, it was no difficult matter to be ultimately agreed upon the essentials for the solid foundation for a united political Socialist movement.

We found that this foundation turned upon two points—first, the proper attitude for a political party of Socialism to assume toward the burning question of trades unionism, and, second, the proper attitude for a political party of Socialism to assume to-



ward the ownership of its press, the voice of the movement.

\* \* \*

### Unionism.

As to the first, the Conference holds: (as the subjoined resolutions I, II and III, set forth in detail) that, without the political movement is backed by a class-conscious, that is, a properly constructed economic organization, ready to take and hold and conduct the productive powers of the land, and thereby ready and able to enforce if need be, and when need be, the fiat of the Socialist ballot of the working class—that WITHOUT such a body in existence, the Socialist political movement will be but a flash in the pan, successful, at best, in affording political preferment to scheming intellectuals, and thereby powerful only to attract such elements. On this specific head the Conference moreover holds, that a political party of Socialism which marches to the polls unarmed by such a properly constructed economic organization, but invites a catastrophe over the land in the measure that it strains for political success, and in the measure that it achieves it. It must be an obvious fact to all serious observers of the times, that the day of the political success of such a party in America, would be the day of its defeat, immediately followed by an industrial and financial crisis, from which none would suffer more than the working class itself.

The Conference holds that for the Socialist political movement to favor A. F. of L. craft unionism is to bluntly deny Socialist principles and aims, for no matter how vigorously the A. F. of L. may cry "Organize! Organize!" in practice it seeks to keep the unorganized, the overwhelming majority of the working class, out of the organization. The facts can easily be proved to a candid world. High initiation fees, limitation of apprentices, cornering the jobs for the few whom they admit into the organization, are but a few of the methods used to discourage organization, which results, not only in lack of organization, but by the craft form of what organization they do have, they isolate

the workers into groups, which, left to fight for themselves, in time of conflict, become the easy prey of the capitalists. On the other hand, the readiness with which certain portions of the exploiting class force their victims to join the A. F. of L. is sufficient condemnation of the organization.

By its own declarations and acts, the A. F. of L. shows that it accepts wage slavery as a finality; and, holding that there is identity of interest between employer and employe, the A. F. of L. follows it out by gladly accepting the vice-presidency of the Belmont Civic Federation for its president, Gompers, thus allying itself with an organization fathered by the capitalist class for the purpose of blurring the class struggle, and for prolonging the present system which is cornered upon the exploitation of labor.

For these reasons the Conference concludes that it is the duty of a political party of Socialism to promote the organization of a properly constructed union, both by elucidating the virtues of such a union and by exposing the vices of craft unionism. Consequently, and as a closing conclusion on this head, it rejects as impracticable vicious and productive only of corruption the theory of neutrality on the economic field. The Conference, true to these views, condemns the A. F. of L. as an obstacle to the emancipation of the working class.

Holding that the political power flows from and is a result of economic power, and that the capitalist is entrenched in the government as the result of his industrial power, the Conference commends as useful to the emancipation of the working class the Industrial Workers of the World, which instead of running away from the class struggle bases itself squarely upon it, and boldly and correctly sets out the Socialist principle "that the working class and the employing class have nothing in common" and that "the working class must come together on the political as well as on the industrial field, to take and hold that which they produce by their labor."



## Party Press.

As to the second, the question of the proper attitude for a political party of Socialism to assume toward the ownership of its press, and literary agencies, the Conference holds (as the subjoined resolution IV, V, VI, VII, set forth in detail) that the revolutionary movement of the working class must have its press. A condition of things that would justify some to maintain that the political party of Socialism has no press, and others to maintain with equal sincerity that it has, is incompatible with that oneness of opinion on essentials that must typify the political party of Socialism. The press and literary agencies are the most powerful weapons of the party. Past and present experience prove that the party but invites annoyance if not ultimate discomfiture by allowing its press and literary agencies to be owned, whatever the guise of such ownership may be, in such manner that any one person or set of persons may retain proprietorship after, whether it be in the party's wisdom or folly, such person, or set of persons, have been thrown out of the party organization.

The party's press and literary agencies must be the party's property. The party itself, and not any one person, or set of persons, however admirable they may be, must have the sole and absolute jurisdiction over the management and contents of the party press and literary agencies. The editors and administrators of the party's press and literary agencies must be the appointees exclusively of the party itself; and their removal must rest with the party only, and must be effective irrespective of any other one person or set of persons. The party itself must be the supreme tribunal that shall pass upon the contents of its press and literature. A democratic organization, of such numbers as a political party of Socialism implies, recognizes the necessity of order with freedom, and of freedom with order. The officials placed immediately in charge of the party's press and literary agencies must feel responsible and dependent upon the

party only. Their high office of trust clothes them with a necessary, but only preliminary authority. Above them in supreme authority must the party be, with its membership reachable upon all subjects, and with power to utter its final decree.

Short of all this, all of which flows from the party's direct ownership, the party's press and literary agencies are a perpetual threat to the party's welfare, being a perpetual threat to that fulness of information and that civilized right of free speech without which no organization can weather the revolutionary storm.

True to these views, the Conference condemns the private ownership as harmful and commends the rigid party ownership as indispensable to the party safety.

\* \* \*

## Discipline.

In a political party of Socialism the word discipline has its two-fold application. First, the discipline of obedience to facts, and obedience to the rules and regulations that the facts prescribe for the realization of the Socialist aim. This is the discipline of education. It is not, nor can it be, produced by party legislation. It is the product of correct training. Necessary to it are unity of purpose, unity of method. The Socialist movement cannot be all things to all men; it can be only one thing, and to only one class—the working class.

Second, discipline also implies the power of the party to visit, with censure or expulsion as punishments, infractions or offences against the party's rules or principles. Rigid adherence to party principle and tactics being necessary to Socialist success, transgressions against the party must be met with punishment according to the gravity of the offence. Membership in the party being voluntary, and the discipline being self-imposed, he who subscribes to the party's ethics does so, not as one yielding submission to imposed authority, but as one bowing to the necessity and desire of maintaining strict adherence to principle and for orderly government in party affairs.



Discipline in this, its two-fold application, is a recognition that knowledge is power and that in union is strength.

\* \* \*

Having closed its labors by setting forth the causes of the separation of the Socialist forces of the State of New Jersey, and of the nation, and by setting forth the solid ground upon which the militant Socialists of New Jersey, and of the nation, can unite into one solid army for working class emancipation, this Conference hands its findings to its two respective constituencies with a firm reliance that good sense and judgment will mark the deliberations of both. The Conference relies upon it that a due appreciation of the great and far-reaching consequences to the Labor movement will animate both its constituencies; and that, inspired by such sentiments, and realizing that his act, in voting upon these important measures, will have far-reaching effect upon our common goal, the overthrow of capitalist domination, each of our members will weigh well and consider the recommendations herein made, and then cast his vote honestly, fearlessly and conscientiously.

With Socialist greeting, fraternally,

#### NEW JERSEY SOCIALIST CONFERENCE.

Socialist Party—Burgess, Cassens, Glanz, Green, Headley, Hueck, James, Killingbeck, Reilly, Ullman, Wilson; not voting, Walker.

Socialist Labor Party—B. Burgholz, Eck, Fallath, Frueh, Gallo, Hossack, McGarry, Mattick, Oatley, Quinlan, Rapp, Schmitter.

The reading of the manifesto was received with hearty applause by both Conference and spectators.

Walker, S. P.—While I agree with many of the points in the manifesto, still I think some of the things are inopportune. To print and refer to the membership is going beyond the powers given by our State convention. We were instructed to see if

ground for unity could be found and then report back to the State convention.

Headley, S. P.—We are not discussing the printing now, we are considering the adoption of the report.

Walker, S. P.—I hold that the document should go to the State convention first. I am simply a delegate from the convention and cannot go outside of that. If the State convention sees fit to adopt it all right.

Killingbeck, S. P.—This manifesto is simply a summing up of our work. We cannot do otherwise than accept it, and we want to get it before our members for the purpose of education, so that when they come to vote upon it they will be able to cast their ballots intelligently. We have the right, if we raise the funds ourselves, to send the proceedings out now, so that when our State convention meets the delegates will know just what this Conference has done; it could not be intelligently disposed of among the other mass of work of the convention. We are forced to take this step because the minutes have been suppressed by our press; the Socialist Review of West Hoboken, has printed the minutes, but it only comes out once a month and reaches too few. Every comrade should read and know all about this work before he casts his vote for or against.

Glanz, S. P.—Comrade Walker seems to have lost track of the State convention resolution which calls upon us to consider how the working class may be united. It will be education for the workers to read the proceedings and the manifesto. If it is a mistake to publish the proceedings now, then it has been a mistake to publish minutes at all. In publishing them I see nothing contrary to our instructions and as to payment we can raise the funds.

Walker, S. P.—We are simply a committee without power to go further than report to our State convention. The object of publishing them now is for the purpose of influencing the members when voting. It was a mistake to publish the minutes at all.



Gallo, S. L. P.—We are now considering the adoption of the report. If your constituency is the State convention, why then report to them, or if it is the party membership through the referendum report to them. Decide that after you adopt the report.

The question was then called for on the adoption of the report as the findings of the Conference, and the motion being put it was carried. S. P., eleven for, Walker not voting; S. L. P., twelve for.

Wilson, S. P.—How would it be to publish the manifesto only? That would cost much less.

Hossack, S. L. P.—The committee considered the printing of the manifesto alone and concluded that while it would be much cheaper, still to publish the manifesto alone would not enlighten the membership as to how the conclusions of the manifesto were arrived at, by reading the entire proceedings the membership will in a sense go through the same experience as we have here.

Wilson, S. P.—It would be proper to order the manifesto printed for general distribution. It is a condensed report. The full proceedings would be the proper thing to submit to the State conventions. We should avoid going beyond our authority, beyond the proper line and yet it should reach the party membership to some extent. We should avoid too great an expense also.

I would move that the manifesto be ordered printed for general distribution, and the entire proceedings referred to the respective State organizations.

Seconded by McGarry, S. L. P.

Eck, S. L. P.—Your committee considered the matter of publication at great length, and we concluded that the proceedings should be published in full, so that the members may know how the findings were arrived at. I would amend that we stand by the recommendation of the committee.

Seconded by Fallath, S. L. P.

Reilly, S. P.—The committee's plan of raising funds will, I

am sure, prove successful. We have prepared sixty subscription lists which should be good for at least \$2 each. The S. L. P. members are posted now, ours are not, and they are just as much entitled to a knowledge of what they are voting for as the S. L. P. members. The giving of information cannot be considered as a scheme to influence votes.

Killingbeck, S. P.—We should publish the entire proceedings; the manifesto alone is not enough. Our minutes have been suppressed by our press. Nine out of ten of our members won't know how our conclusions were arrived at. They will read that we have condemned the A. F. of L., which will be tantamount to their minds that what Berger and the Worker have been saying of us is true. They will conclude that Berger and the Worker were right, and that this Conference is only an attempt to disrupt the Socialist and labor movement, unless we can tell them why we condemn the A. F. of L. While I personally disagreed with the form in which some of the resolutions were adopted, still I am pleased that they were adopted, and the spirit of them. By simply reading the manifesto some of our members would get a wrong impression. The full minutes should certainly go with the manifesto.

Hueck, S. P.—I look at it the same way as Comrade Killingbeck. The minutes and manifesto should go together in pamphlet form, and I think it would be wise to distribute it throughout the country. I am sure that members all over the country will want to read it.

Oatley, S. L. P.—I consider this a great historic document of the utmost importance to the Socialist movement. Here is the first document looking toward the unification of the Socialist forces of the country, and every Socialist in the country should read it. As to the expense, we have gone down in our pockets to fight one another for six years and I think we can surely go down in those same pockets to help bring about a good bona fide movement of Socialism in the United States.



Glanz, S. P.—We need not worry over paying for the printing. By reading the papers I see that there is a widespread sentiment for unity all over the country. Comrades elsewhere are daily asking as to what this Conference is doing. I favor the full proceedings being printed.

Quinlan, S. L. P.—I don't see why any opposition should come from the other side. The S. P. suggested the Conference. The S. L. P. men are thoroughly familiar with what has been done here. It is now a question of money. Wilson favors a compromise to cut down expense. I think we can raise the money easily enough.

Schmitter, S. L. P.—It will be easy to report the findings to your State convention, and I see no reason why the party membership should not know all about the proceedings now.

James, S. P.—I was the one who made the motion at the last session that the whole proceedings be published, so that our members would know all about it. Those of our members who have not attended the Conference cannot cast their ballots intelligently unless they read the full proceedings. If we had a press the same as the S. L. P. has, where we could depend upon having the minutes fully and accurately printed we would not have to do this, but you saw how our press garbled even what they did print. We must publish the proceedings in full; there is nothing else for us to do, and we can raise the money.

Eck, S. L. P.—To print the pamphlet we need money, and I think we should get together and not postpone the work. If we want unity let us show that we do, and the way to show that we do is by making our members fully aware of what we have done. Comrades elsewhere will want to read of our work and will be only too glad to buy the pamphlet, and I think it would be perfectly proper to put a price on it so that by the sale of it we can make up whatever shortage there is on the lists. If there is anything over we can donate it to the Moyer-Haywood, or other fund. Those who contribute should get a copy free.

Killingbeck, S. P.—These subscription lists are really advance orders for the pamphlets.

Wilson, S. P.—Don't think I would stand to block any necessary work of the Conference, but I realize the importance of putting ourselves right at a critical stage. We can make a report to the convention, but our members should know the result of our work before the election of delegates to the State convention. I think my objections on the score of expense have been met. I would withdraw my motion provided the seconder consents. McGarry agreed to this. Eck's amendment (to stand by recommendation of the committee that entire proceedings be put in pamphlet) was then made the original motion.

Hossack, S. L. P.—I will guarantee for the S. L. P. that we will raise half the expense.

Green, S. P.—For a point of information, I would like to know what label will it be printed under?

Headley, S. P.—It will be a union label, all right. (Laughter.)

Gallo, S. L. P.—The members will want to read the proceedings, not a label.

Green, S. P.—I am not opposed to the I. W. W. label, I only want to know.

The question to publish the full proceedings in pamphlet form being called for, and put, it was carried unanimously.

The committee, by unanimous vote, was continued, with full power to publish.

Reilly, S. P.—While the committee has been given full power, this question of label may come up. To be consistent we should have the I. W. W. label as we have declared for that organization. I may be charged with drumming up business for the Labor News, but I don't know where else the work can be so well done and have the I. W. W. label. I was told last night that De Leon and Hossack are running this Conference and that Hossack is leading me by the nose. Those who circulate such stories might say



that this whole plan to publish is a scheme to give a fat job to the Labor News.

Glanz, S. P.—There should be no hesitation on that point; if the Labor News has the I. W. W. label, by all means have it done there.

Hossack, S. L. P.—I would move that when we adjourn it be to meet at the call of the secretaries.

Seconded and unanimously carried.

Killingbeck, S. P.—I move that the respective State committees be requested to call upon locals of the S. P. and sections of the S. L. P. to hold joint meetings to discuss the findings.

Seconded and carried unanimously.

Green, S. P.—We should also take action looking toward joint S. P. and S. L. P. demonstrations on the Moyer-Haywood arrest.

Eck, S. L. P.—In some localities rival meetings are to be held which is not a good plan. The W. F. M. is an integral part of the I. W. W. Meetings should be under the auspices of the I. W. W. to insure success. We should not split the forces, when we can hold monster demonstrations together. The Western Federation of Miners is not the only organization attacked. The master class know that it is revolutionary unionism they are up against. The blow is being struck against us as well as the W. F. M. They have started the fight against us in the West; our day will surely come here. Moyer and Haywood are now in the shadow of the gallows and at such a time we must not split our forces. Let us rally to the support of the I. W. W. in this affair.

Wilson, S. P.—How should we work in localities where there is no I. W. W.?

Eck, S. L. P.—You couldn't do it that way in such places, but where there is I. W. W. organization let us support their efforts.

Glanz, S. P.—Wilson's objection can easily be overcome. In such places the S. P. and the S. L. P. should jointly take the initiative. Moyer and Haywood are under arrest because they are I. W. W. men.

Headley, S. P.—Moyer and Haywood are persecuted as Socialists also.

Reilly, S. P.—Bloody Sunday brought us together, and I think it is not necessary to pass a motion to get us together this time. We will get together.

Headley, S. P.—We should certainly get together on this matter.

Walker, S. P.—To get results let the S. P. or the S. L. P. inaugurate the meetings. Industrial meetings will do more harm than good. Political meetings should be held. In 1887 the K. of L. and the A. F. of L. passed resolutions, and the men were hanged just the same. Moyer and Haywood are held as political prisoners, and only by a strenuous kick as citizens can we strike terror to public officials from the ward heeler up. The other kind of meetings will cut no ice at all. They will do more harm than good.

Gallo, S. L. P.—The I. W. W., the S. P. or the S. L. P. can take the initiative and call conferences, then hold joint demonstrations.

Oatley, S. L. P.—The S. P. and S. L. P. should back up the I. W. W. You can't scare officials with political meetings. It is the masters of the politicians, the economic masters, we are after. The fight is an economic one and we should back up the I. W. W.

Quinlan, S. L. P.—While political rights have been violated, they were violated in the economic interest of the Mine Owners' Association.

Hueck, S. P.—The fight is clearly against the economic organization.

Frueh, S. L. P.—I don't see as a resolution would do much good, but we can recommend that the S. L. P. and S. P. act in conjunction.

Schmitter, S. L. P.—I move that it be the sense of this body that there should be united action on the Moyer-Haywood demonstrations.



Seconded and carried unanimously.

Glanz, S. P.—I have been asked as to the possible outcome of this Conference, whether any practical attempt at union, or for paving the way for union has been made. I answered that the action we have so far taken has been educational and constructive, and is necessary before steps can be taken for practical unity. But it seems to me that while we have talked unity we have made no definite utterance upon it. I expected that the other side would bring it up, but seeing that they haven't broached the subject, I move the following resolution for the purpose of having the Conference utter itself:

Resolved, That in order to secure united and harmonious action among Socialists in the United States, this Conference recommends that the Socialist Labor Party unite with the Socialist Party, and we further recommend that the National Committee of the Socialist Party and the National Committee of the Socialist Labor Party, hold a joint conference, in the near future, for the purpose of devising ways and means to unite the two parties.

Seconded by S. P. side.

James, S. P.—I don't believe Dan will stand for that. (Laughter.)

Wilson, S. P.—I rise to a point of information: Will we not be anticipating the action of our State constituencies?

Headley, S. P. (Chairman)—Your point is well made.

Glanz, S. P.—I want to see a more definite move made toward unity. I have put it this way in order to bring the matter up, so that those who ask can be shown that we have taken definite steps to unite.

Headley, S. P.—We submit the manifesto to our respective organizations as a basis for unity. If adopted by both parties it then becomes the basis for unity and the practical steps will follow as a matter of course.

Killingbeck, S. P.—Our State organizations will have to take

action along these lines in the event of the adoption of the manifesto. I am just as anxious to see unity as anybody, but in that resolution we call upon the S. L. P. to unite with the S. P. It is asking them to give up their organization and join us. That proposition is ridiculous. It is presumptuous to ask them to unite with us off hand.

Glanz, S. P.—Comrade Killingbeck and the others ought to know that it is impossible to do that without a referendum. If there are defects in our organization it is up to them to point them out.

Reilly, S. P.—I think we are getting away from the point. We are to find a basis for unity and promote it. If anyone asks what is being done, refer them to the minutes, surely they show what has been done. If the manifesto is adopted it will come before both organizations nationally and the two national organizations will have to do the rest. On the basis of our manifesto we believe unity can be accomplished and to have produced the basis for unity is a great practical work.

Eck, S. L. P.—Perhaps it boils down as to what name we should unite under. If unity is accomplished the name is not so important. All over the country the militants are anxious to be united. When it comes up nationally that part of it will be considered. It is not for us of New Jersey to decide upon the name beforehand. I don't care about the name so long as there is unity. The name can be left to time to determine.

Frueh, S. L. P.—I can't favor the resolution as it reads. I came here to do my share for unity and must say that to a great extent my best hopes have been realized. We have made great progress, and have nothing to lose; and everything to gain by leaving some matters to future developments. All over the country this question of unity is sure to come up, sooner or later, and it would be a mistake for us to force matters. It is also a mistake to say that we have not done anything practical. We met to consider if there were differences that warranted our



keeping apart. Our manifesto says that there are no such differences. If that is endorsed by both parties, then we must get together. Comrades, if there be any that would stay the unification of forces their efforts will be vain. The revolutionary developments, swift developments they are now, will compel us to join. I am convinced that the revolution is before the door. The times are serious and if past and present experiences are not enough to push the S. P. and the S. L. P. together the further actions of our enemies certainly will.

Walker, S. P.—I think Comrade Glanz offered his resolution in good spirit, and I think he made a wise move. When the proposition came up in our State convention the old vets in the S. P. shrugged their shoulders. While I believe it a wise resolution I don't believe it will have any effect. You can talk to the majority of Socialists in New Jersey and they will tell you that they don't know where this unity will wind up. We have discussed all the questions on the globe here, but no sight of unity yet. When are we going to have unity? That is the question. It is a wise thing, a master move—for the other side, and they should accept it. The S. P. has so far yielded all the points, and has raised a hot nest for itself here, and all over the country, and it will be hotter yet. We should not put this off. There are forces at work, call them economic determinism if you will, that make unity necessary. If you don't unite bodily it will come by a wearing away process. I would rather see the name of S. L. P. and like their thorough discipline and organization. They should get in and build.

Wilson, S. P.—When I raised my point of order, that to consider now the mode of procedure on unity is to anticipate events, the point was well taken. Why then this discussion?

Headley, S. P.—I realize that in recommending measures, that in the course of events will have to be taken by our national organizations, provided our action is endorsed in this State, is not only inconsistent but presumptuous. I fail to see the use

of going along this line. Leave to the national organizations their functions.

Glanz, S. P.—I think we are quibbling on this. I don't care whether the name is S. P. or S. L. P. Change my resolution to read S. L. P. if you wish. But I do want an expression by this Conference—a recommendation that steps be taken to unite. We have found a basis for unity; if that basis is accepted by both parties then I want steps taken to bring about actual unity. I don't wish it left simply as a basis endorsed. The resolution will force a vote upon the practical question of unity. There will be a fight in the S. P. against unity, this resolution will force the fight. I would rather see the resolution defeated than tabled or altered other than as I have suggested.

Schmitter, S. L. P.—I see that Comrade Glanz argument boils down to this: he does not want to see the issue side-tracked. The State convention of the S. P. he fears might not sanction the work of the Conference and in that event he wants this Conference to have power to act by having a recommendation that will provide against its work being blocked. Behind the back of the Conference they are talking of traps and trying to discount the work done here. We of the S. L. P. have been asked if we are sincere for unity. I am sure the S. L. P. will adopt the manifesto. Comrade Glanz fears that the S. P. vote may not carry further than adoption and he wants us to recommend practical action beyond that.

Hossack, S. L. P.—Surely if the manifesto carries upon referendum to your membership, it means that the State organization will have to carry the matter further—to the national organization.

Glanz, S. P.—Certain members of the S. P. are trying to block the work of this Conference. This Conference has made an honest attempt to unite the two parties. The manifesto leaves it to the membership. It does not say to them, that this Conference, in addition to finding a basis for unity, also says there must be unity.



Oatley, S. L. P.—I do not think there is any need for such a resolution as the one we are considering. If anyone asks if anything looking toward unity has been done, you can certainly point to the manifesto as conclusive evidence that there has.

The resolution being put it was defeated. S. P. five for, seven against; S. L. P., twelve against.

Gallo, S. L. P.—I would like it recorded that the S. L. P. side voted against the resolution as they think it premature. I don't want it to appear as if grounds for unity having been found, the S. L. P. voted down a unity proposition, which would give a wrong impression. While I see what Comrade Glanz is getting at I don't think his resolution covered the object.

Reilly, S. P.—Isn't it understood that if the membership adopt the findings of the Conference the State organization will have to take the further necessary steps?

Gallo, S. L. P.—They may say we led you in, and then try to block your work. I am glad Comrade Glanz brought the matter up and think that a motion covering what he has in mind should be passed.

Headley, S. P.—I move the following: That in the event of the findings of this Conference being approved by the S. P. and the S. L. P., in the State of New Jersey, steps be taken to bring about a national conference between the two organizations, in order to bring about unity on a national basis. Seconded.

Gallo, S. L. P.—Offered as a part of the motion, which was accepted: We the delegates here assembled pledge ourselves to take the necessary steps.

Killingbeck, S. P.—To make it more emphatic, I would add: That immediately on the acceptance of the basis of unity by our respective State organizations we will call upon our national organizations to issue the necessary referendums.

This also was accepted as a part of the motion.

Hossack, S. L. P.—I would like to ask Comrade Glanz if this covers what he has in mind?

Glanz, S. P.—Yes, it does. I want the whole Conference to go on record as favoring unity and pledging itself to bring it about. I have received communications saying that I have been led into a trap and that the Conference is not for unity, and this will be my answer.

The question being called for, the motion: Resolved, That in the event of the findings of this Conference being approved by the S. P. and the S. L. P. in the State of New Jersey, steps be taken to bring about a national conference between the two organizations, in order to bring about unity on a national basis; and we the delegates here assembled pledge ourselves to take the necessary steps, immediately, on the acceptance of the basis of unity by our respective State organizations, calling upon our national organizations to issue the necessary referendums: it was unanimously adopted.

Killingbeck, S. P.—I move that the standing committee be empowered to pass upon the minutes of this session and to authorize same for publication.

Carried unanimously.

The Conference then adjourned to meet upon call of the secretaries.

The Conference, which first met December 17, 1905, having now practically ended its labors adjourned with cheers, in the fervent hope, even confidence, that it had laid the foundation for a class-conscious, united and powerful revolutionary Socialist political movement, not only in New Jersey but in the nation, and that it had also paved the way for the accomplishment of this condition precedent for the overthrow of the capitalist reign of rapine and terror.

JAMES M. REILLY,

Secretary for S. P.

JOHN HOSSACK,

Secretary for S. L. P.



The foregoing minutes were adopted, and ordered sent to the Socialist press for publication by unanimous vote of the committee empowered by the Conference to pass upon said minutes, which committee met at S. P. headquarters, Newark, Saturday evening, March 17th, 1906.

GLANZ, JAMES and REILLY for S. P.

ECK and HOSSACK for S. L. P.

GALLO, S. L. P., absent.